INDIAN ENGLISH:

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ERRORS OF IDIOM
MADE BY INDIANS IN WRITING ENGLISH



1913

BY

GEORGE CLIFFORD WHITWORTH

INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE (RETIRED)

Author of "An Anglo-Indian Dictionary"

॥ বিজ্ঞান-ভবন ॥

ক্রমিক নং....৪৬৬

আলমারী নং....১৩.. তাক নং...৯...

॥ রবেশ্বরী, খড়দহ ॥

LETCHWORTH, HERTS.

PRINTED BY GARDEN CITY PRESS LIMITED

1907

CONTENTS

THE CALCUTTA LIBRARY
10, Theatre Road
CALCUTTA

CHAPTER I.

Page

INTRODUCTORY - - - - - - - - 5

CHAPTER II.

THE ARTICLES - - - - - - - - - 11

SECTION I.—The definite article used where no article is required - - - - - - - - 15

SECTION II.—No article used where the definite article is required - - - - - - - - 22

SECTION III.—The indefinite article used where no article is required - - - - - - - - 28

SECTION IV.—No article used where the indefinite article is required - - - - - - - - 31

SECTION V.—The definite article used where the indefinite is required - - - - - - - - 34

SECTION VI.—The indefinite article used where the definite is required - - - - - - - - 38

SECTION VII.—An article used instead of a pronoun or adjective - - - - - - - - 39

CHAPTER III.

ADVERBS - - - - - - - - - 40

SECTION I.—Adverbs combined with verbs so as to alter the meaning of the verb - - - - - 40

SECTION II.—Adverbs in other cases - - - - 48

CHAPTER IV.

PREPOSITIONS - - - - - - - - 59

SECTION I.—Particular prepositions required after particular verbs - - - - - - - - 59

SECTION II.—Prepositions in other cases - - - 63

CHAPTER V.

CONJUNCTIONS - - - - - - - - 79

CHAPTER VI.

NOUNS - - - - - - - - - 85

CHAPTER VII.

Page

PRONOUNS - - - - - - - - 91

SECTION I.—Possessive pronouns - - - - - 91

SECTION II.—Other pronouns - - - - - - 94

CHAPTER VIII.

ADJECTIVES - - - - - - - - 98

CHAPTER IX.

VERBS - - - - - - - - - 104

SECTION I.—Auxiliary verbs - - - - - - 104

SECTION II.—Misuse of transitive verbs as intransitive and of intransitive verbs as transitive - - - - - 116

SECTION III.—Misuse of the different tenses - - - - 126

SECTION IV.—Misuse of the gerund for the infinitive, and of the infinitive for the gerund - - - - - 140

CHAPTER X.

SYNTAX - - - - - - - - - 148

SECTION I.—Errors as to the position of the verb in relation to the subject - - - - - - - 148

SECTION II.—Other errors as to the order of words in a sentence - - - - - - - - 155

SECTION III.—Errors of construction affecting the meaning of a sentence - - - - - - - 163

SECTION IV.—Errors in particular idioms, and in the use of titles - - - - - - - - 171

SECTION V.—Other errors in the construction of sentences - 187

CHAPTER XI.

METAPHORS - - - - - - - - 210

CHAPTER XII.

VOCABULARY - - - - - - - - 220

SECTION I.—Words wrongly used - - - - - 220

SECTION II.—Wrong Compounds - - - - - 240

SECTION III.—New Words - - - - - - 244

SECTION IV.—Slang and Colloquial Expressions - - 245

INDIAN ENGLISH

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ERRORS OF IDIOM MADE BY INDIANS IN WRITING ENGLISH.



CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

I HOPE no one will take up this little book expecting to find an amusing collection of those linguistic flights to which imaginative Indians occasionally commit themselves. I am myself too painfully conscious of the immense superiority of Indians to Englishmen in the way of acquiring foreign languages, for the preparation of any such work to be a congenial task to me. No; my purpose is entirely different, and is perfectly serious. For many years past, both in hearing arguments from the Bar and in reading Indian books and newspapers, I have been struck with the wonderful command which Indians—and not only those who have been to England—have obtained over the English language for all practical purposes. At the same time, I have often felt what a pity it is that men exhibiting this splendid facility should now and then mar their compositions by little errors of idiom which jar upon the ear of the native Englishman.

Considering, in conjunction with this great natural ability, that the Indians are the inheritors of the most elaborate language that the world has known, and that their forefathers regarded grammar (vyákaran)* as a vedánga or limb of their sacred veda, it seems well worth while to try and render them a small service by showing them how their admirable knowledge of our language may be made still more complete.

But to show to what a high level they have already attained, I will here give two or three examples of clear and forcible writing taken from Indian newspapers :—

"Every administration is liable to commit mistakes. The British administration in India, as at present constituted, is peculiarly so. The wonder is that it commits not so many but so few blunders, and this is undoubtedly due to its general desire to do good to the people and to harass them as little as possible. Now, when an especially big blunder is committed, the Extremist, disregardful of the past, maintains that it is a necessary result of British Rule. The Moderate, who remembers that all the liberties we possess are the spontaneous gift of that Rule, while criticising the blunder quite as strongly and pleading for its reversal quite as earnestly as the Extremist, does not believe and does not proclaim that it arose out of the inherent incompatibility of British Rule with the best interests of India."

"These voices of the dead come to us with peculiar force at the present moment. They are a lesson and a warning. They call us back to sense and sobriety and remind us that, after all, philosophy must prevail over passion. One of the aspirations of the moment is the creation of an Indian nationality. A nationality is never created by voluntary, spasmodic efforts. It grows; and in growing takes its own time. The natural laws of social evolution will not bend to the caprice of impetuous agitators, and will not be hastened in their opera-

* The prominence given to grammar is noticed by the Chinese traveller, Hiouen Thsang, who was in India in the seventh century A.D. He names the five branches of Indian knowledge as, **grammar, fine arts, medicine, logic, and metaphysics.**

tion by the forces of racial antipathy or political animus. But whether created or developed, nationality will demand the inspiration of religion. The loves and hates of religion are the deepest. A common sentiment of political opposition to the Government will be a poor bond of union for a nationality which consists of races and sects separated by the widest and deepest of religious differences."

"Lord Curzon provokes thought while the opportunist would lull it to sleep: he sets up a goal in a conspicuous place and with great ceremony, and works towards it, while worldly wisdom would occupy itself with the breeze and the current of the moment. For such men public life becomes an arena of strife rather than a pedestal to greatness. They have to acquire greatness through victory."

And now I will add one or two passages which, while they show great command of language for all practical purposes, are yet marred by some of those little errors of phraseology or construction which I aim at enabling Indian writers to avoid:—

"He is strenuous without being fussy and independent without that vain kind of self-assertion which is so often the bane of many masterful spirits. His administration of Baroda has been a continued triumph of indigenous talent, showing what good an Indian Prince can do his subjects if he is intelligent and patriotic without falling a victim to the superficialities of European life and associations. The most notable trait in his character is his sturdy independence commanding the respect of all who have followed his career. He is a true Maratha Prince who wouldn't stoop to any kind of toadyism and who would not mind letting the world know of his views on subjects which one less brave would fear to tackle lest he should offend the Foreign Office."

"If such be the results of the partition measure, though, we grant, that the author of it might not have bargained for them, it cannot too strongly be condemned. For these some months we have been hearing of nothing but "disturbances." If it was Comilla yesterday it is Mymensing to-day, whose turn it would be to-morrow, it is not possible to foresee. But the whole province is excited and there is no knowing what all this would lead to eventually. Especially the telegram about the desecration of certain Hindu idols by a mob of Mahomedan roughs

is more disquieting than any previous news. Hitherto, it would appear that the disturbance was confined to public streets, but when it comes to breaking open temples and mutilating images, the situation has gone to a stage which calls for the most drastic remedies."

"More than once hope was expressed in these columns that the Indian Nationalist leaders, who hold all-India congresses and conventions and conferences, to impress the Government with the solidarity of the popular movement for political privileges, would, in order to justify their claims to popular leadership and public confidence, go to the aid of the people of Bengal and the Punjab, and help them to compose their differences which they had failed to do by themselves, and set matters right between them and the Government. It was pointed out that if they did not employ their good offices to remove the misunderstandings and bickerings prevailing between the people themselves and the people and the Government, on account of what seemed to be questions of provincial and local interest, the Government would have to step in with strong measures of their own, which might throw the whole country into the vortex of political strife, and the consequences of which it would not be easy to foretell."

The longer I have been engaged upon my present task the more have I been impressed with the extreme difficulty every foreigner must experience in learning the English language. For example, of the following four sentences the first two are correct and the other two are not; but it would be hard for a foreigner **to see why** :—

(1) There were many people there.
(2) There were a great many people there.
(3) There were a many people there.
(4) There were great many people there.

See examples (4, 5, and 6), pages 31 and 32.

Again, the following sentence would probably sound correct to almost any foreigner :—

"The English nation is by far and away the strongest and the best arbiter."

He would be familiar with "by far the strongest," and also with "far and away the strongest," and would wonder why the two adverbial expressions might not be combined. See example (12), page 51.

Here is another very simple-looking sentence, but which yet betrays its foreign authorship:—

"The meeting lasted over a couple of hours."

See example (82), page 73. So also is the following:—

"No advice takes any effect."

But the expression "take effect" will not permit of the insertion of the partitive adjective "any."

Or, again, what could be more puzzling to a foreigner than to be told that both the following passages are incorrect, though what is the fault in one appears to be corrected in the other:—

"The American lady landed on the English soil."

See example (4), page 16, and

"As soon as he puts his foot on Indian shores."

See example (32), page 26.

And once more: the following two sentences are quite correct:—

"The same terms were accepted by the Muhammadans."

"The terms offered to the Kathis were accepted by the Muhammadans."

But when an Indian writes:—

"The same terms offered to the Kathis were accepted by the Muhammadans,"

we have to tell him he is wrong. See example (86), page 207.

If such difficulties may occur in the case of short sentences dealing with simple subjects, we cannot be surprised to find numerous mistakes when delicate refinements of language are required to express intricate complexities of thought.

For facility of reference I have roughly classified the passages selected for comment, and have arranged them under different headings, as shown in the table of contents. And I have also added an index. The passages are in nearly all cases given exactly as they appeared in the original publication. But occasionally I have, for the sake of brevity, omitted words or clauses not bearing on the point to be elucidated; or, for the sake of clearness, substituted the antecedent noun for a pronoun in the text. And occasionally, when two errors occur in a single passage, I have, to avoid confusion, corrected one while illustrating the other. In such cases the passage may appear in two different chapters.

CHAPTER II.

THE ARTICLES.

As in the Indian languages there is no definite article corresponding to our *the*, nor any indefinite one corresponding to our *a* or *an*, except the occasional use of the first numeral (*ek*) when the single number requires to be specially expressed, it is naturally extremely difficult for any Indian to know when to use the one article or the other, or none at all. This gives room for six classes of mistakes, the first three of which are very frequent. Thus (1) the definite article may be used when none is required, or (2) none may be used when the definite is required; (3) the indefinite may be used when none is required, or (4) none when the indefinite is required; or (5) the definite article may be used for the indefinite, or (6) the indefinite for the definite. 19134

I will give examples of each class, and in this, as in all other cases, the examples will be of actual occurrence in well-written books or newspapers. I will then add (7) a few instances in which an article has been used where it would be better to use a pronoun or the adjective "any."

But before setting forth the examples it may be well to consider first some of the main principles involved. While there are six classes of error to be illustrated, it will be observed that only three alternatives of use are in question, namely (1) to use no article, (2) to use the definite, or (3) the indefinite article. And the first and most general principle to be borne in mind is that (1) no article is put before a noun which is used in an abstract or general sense; (2) the definite

article is put before a noun which is a particular thing, or alone of its kind, or is separated by definition from other similar things; (3) the indefinite article is put before a noun that expresses something which is individual but not selected or distinguished from other things of the same kind. It may be well to repeat this briefly and conspicuously thus :—

(1) No article—abstract or general;

(2) Definite article—particular or defined;

(3) Indefinite article—individual, but not definite or particular.

Thus we say :—

(1) "Virtue is its own reward"—where the abstract quality of virtue is intended;

(2) "*The* virtue of obedience"—where a particular virtue is named;

(3) "Assume *a* virtue if you have it not"—where some individual but undefined virtue is meant.

So again :—

(1) War is terrible;

(2) The war is ended;

(3) A war broke out;

where we have (1) a general statement as to war in general, (2) an announcement about a particular war that was already present to the mind of the hearer, and (3) an announcement about a certain war not yet defined.

And again :—

(1) He is not susceptible to influence;

(2) The influence of his father;

(3) A new influence began to bear;

where we have (1) a statement as to a certain person's

insusceptibility to influence in general, (2) a defined influence, and (3) an influence, described indeed as new, but not yet defined as to source or character.

The second head of the above rule may be enlarged. When a concrete thing is alone of its kind, the definite article is used. Thus we say "the sun" because (apart from astronomy) we are concerned with only one sun. On the same principle the definite article is required with a superlative adjective, because the superlative distinguishes the thing named from all others, and sets it apart and alone—the best way, the wisest man, the oldest book, are, each of them, one only. On the same principle again the definite article is used with any thing that is defined, and so separated from its class. We say "Hope springs eternal," but *the* hope of happiness or of anything that fixes the scope of the hope. There is, however, a wide borderland between definition and mere attribution, in which the use of the definite article is optional. We say "Control is necessary." We could not say "The control is necessary." But if we partially define the control by adding the words "of turbulent persons," we may either use or omit the definite article. Ordinarily the mere addition of an adjective (not in the superlative degree), though it goes some way towards definition, will not warrant the introduction of the article—we could not say "The strict control is necessary."

Another point to notice is that the definite article is occasionally used *not* for any force which it conveys, but because analogy makes it convenient in connection with the *form* of the sentence. Thus "Eastern philosophy" and "the philosophy of the East" mean one and the same thing; but where a noun is followed by the preposition "of," the use of the article before it is natural. Compare the

third and fourth lines of the following :—

"The earth and every common sight
To me did seem
Apparell'd in celestial light,
The glory and the freshness of a dream."

where "celestial light" is without the article, but "the glory and the freshness of . . ." take the article. So again in the same poem :—

"The winds come to me from the fields of sleep."

though there is no reason for particularising the fields of sleep. Also in Gray's Elegy :—

"*The* paths of glory lead but to the grave,"

though logically there is no need of the article. And in Marvel's Ode :—

"So restless Cromwell could not cease
In *the* inglorious arts of peace";

where, if "peaceful arts" had been substituted for "arts of peace," the article would have been omitted.

It is, however, far from being the case that the article is always required before a noun followed by "of"; and perhaps the best test by which to determine whether the article is or is not needed is to take the two connected nouns together as one word, and then consider whether the sense is general or particular. Thus we should say :—

Baskets of fruit come every day to the market,

where the baskets of fruit are indefinite; but, on the other hand,

The baskets of fruit in the market are beautiful,

where the baskets of fruit are one particular collection. So again,

Flashes of light were seen at intervals,

where the flashes of light are indefinite; but

The flashes of light were dazzling

where particular flashes are referred to.

The next principle that I would ask attention to is that while the definite article is primarily used to specify, to distinguish, to make particular, it has another use of quite a different—indeed, almost an opposite—character. That is when it is used before a noun to indicate a genus or species, as we say "the crow," not meaning any particular crow, but the whole family of crows. Yet not the family collectively, but rather an imaginary individual as typical of the family. "The elephant is the largest quadruped"—not any particular elephant, but an imaginary typical elephant. So again,

"Flowers of all hues, and without thorn *the* rose."

Similarly the definite article is sometimes used before a noun expressing some concrete thing regarded not as an individual but as a type or class. Thus we speak of the power of *the sword*, the influence of *the pen*, not meaning any particular sword or pen, but the sword or pen, so to speak, in the abstract.

I pass now to actual Indian examples, under the several heads.

SECTION I.—THE DEFINITE ARTICLE USED WHERE NONE IS REQUIRED.

(1) The police who act as guardians of *the* internal order.

"Order" is here an abstract noun, and it is not defined—only an adjective is applied to it (see page 13). Therefore no article should have been used.

(2) To the several causes ascribed, *the* inordinate memory training may perhaps be added. Dr. Aiyangar is no doubt *the* one of the very few advocates of child-study in England.

As to the first italicised "the" the above rule applies. As to the second, there is nothing in the sentence to distinguish Dr. Aiyangar from the other advocates referred to.

(3) Practical effort should be commended and brought to *the* public notice.

The same rule again applies.

(4) The Russian lady landed on *the* English soil.

The article should be omitted. Though "soil" is a material substance, the name is used in this connection in an abstract sense. "On English soil" does not present a picture to the mind any more than, for instance, "within English jurisdiction" would. Contrast with this the word "shores," as used in example (32) on page 26.

(5) *The* past many hundreds of years.

There is nothing definite about the phrase "many hundreds of years," whether past or future.

(6) I am of *the* opinion that religion is the highest study of man.

This would be correct if several different opinions had been mentioned and the writer wished to express that he adhered to this particular one. But that was not so—he was merely expressing an opinion where none had been expressed, and so he should have said, "I am of opinion."

(7) This will supply *the* information which is very urgently wanted.

Similarly here there had been no previous question of one kind of information or another being wanted—the writer was making a first intimation that certain steps would lead to the supply of information that was wanted.

(8) Causes that check the reform movement of *the* modern times.

Here "modern times" means modern times in general—an undefined period; therefore the use of the article is wrong. Similarly we would say, "In recent years, "In early days"; but, on the contrary, "In *the* early years of the century."

(9) It is an encouraging sign of the progress which *the* educated Indians are making.

Here again educated Indians in general are meant, not the educated Indians of a particular province or caste; therefore the article is out of place.

(10) *The* Religion grounded in Science.

This is the title of the official organ of the Dev Samaj. As such it strikes oddly on the English ear, though perhaps not positively incorrect. It would, of course, be quite correct to speak of "the religion which is grounded on science," as distinguished from other religions; but when religion in the abstract is taken and referred to a particular foundation such as science, the title of the work would be "Religion grounded on science."

(11) The causes usually assigned to a rise in *the* prices.

Prices in general are meant, and the article should have been omitted.

(12) He took *the* credit for having done all the good works.

This is logically correct, and if the credit in question were already in contemplation, would be absolutely correct, but the ordinary idiom is to say, "to take credit for," without inserting the article.

(13) Last, though not *the* least, they persist in refusing the honours due.

"Least" is here an adverb, not an adjective, and therefore cannot take the article. It would be quite correct to

use both "last" and "least" as adjectives, and say, "The last item, though not the least."

(14) Many who were not *the* members of the reform association, and were as much gentlemen as the members of the samaj, did not join it.

The statement that the persons in question did not hold the status in question is distributive, not collective, and therefore the definite article should be omitted before the word "members."

(15) The Aujuman-i-Islam acted as *the* host to the Conference.

"Host" here stands not for a concrete person, but for the abstract character or capacity of host.

(16) In Europe Universities are not *the* examining boards, but scientific institutes where professors and pupils co-operate.

If a question had arisen as to who are the examining boards, the use of the article would have been right; but the question is as to what the universities are, and the statement is that their nature is not that of examining boards, etc.

(17) Should anything come between what we feel to be right and what *the* society forces us to do.

Society in general, and not any particular society is meant.

(18) Ignorant of *the* human nature.

If human nature were in question as distinguished from other forms of nature, this would be correct. Not so when human nature is the whole back-ground to which reference is made.

(19) More than twelve gentlemen have enrolled themselves as *the* members of the association, and an attempt is being made to include more.

Obviously those enrolled are not *the* members of the asso-

ciation (except for the time being), as others are expected to join.

(20) The verdict of *the* politicians had been that Persia was doomed for ever.

Politicians in general are meant, not some contemplated class of politicians.

(21) In the government of a large dependency conscience and self-restraint are *the* very essential elements.

The adverb "very" expresses a high degree, but not the superlative degree, so the definite article is out of place. There might be other very essential elements besides the two mentioned. It would be correct to say "*the most* essential elements," but the meaning would be different. I do not mean to say that the definite article is never to be used before the adverb "very" qualifying an adjective. We might say, for instance, "The very early events of the war"; but there the events in question are referred to collectively. In the text above the predication as to conscience and self-restraint is made of them distributively. And, of course, the definite article may be used on occasion before the *adjective* "very," as before any other adjective.

(22) Posterity will discern these gems of *the* purest ray serene illuminating the dark caves of history.

He is a bold writer who ventures to amend Gray. "The purest ray serene" is indeed not wrong; but "purest ray serene" is better. We have two adjectives, one of the superlative, and the other of the positive degree, applied to one noun. Ordinarily, no doubt, the superlative would take the definite article; but then the positive would not. We could not say "of the ray serene." But we could say, "of purest ray," because, as just explained, the superlative is often used to express a very high, but not

necessarily the highest degree. Besides, of the two epithets, "serene" is the more striking one in sense, and it is given the more salient position, being placed at the end of the line, and bearing the rhyme (with "unseen" in the third line). So that altogether it is better to exclude the article for the sake of "serene," than to include it for the sake of "purest."

(23) Reuter has plied *the* Fleet Street with the most sensational telegrams.

The article is here out of place, as "Fleet Street" is a proper name, and proper names take no article. There are, however, some apparent exceptions to this. For instance, we may say "The High Street" as well as "High Street"; but that is because "High" in this connection is equivalent to chief, or principal—the High Street is the principal street of a town. Again, we may say "*the* Agra road" as well as "Agra Road"; but in so doing we do not use the term as quite a proper name, but rather in a descriptive way, as "the road that leads to Agra." Sometimes the definite article is itself part of a proper name, as "The Strand," "The Panjab."

(24) In the heart of *the* Haidarabad city.

We should say either "Haidarabad city" (where the proper name dominates the common noun), or else "the city of Haidarabad."

(25) He contributes a review to *the* "India."

(26) He was a graduate of *the* Cambridge University.

A proper name takes no article. But observe, with reference to example (25), that the article is often part of the proper name itself, as "The Indian Spectator."

(27) India had a place in the King's speech in o Parliament.

(28) They might well ask why he did not take more and see that *the* Parliament came to the same conclus as himself.

"Parliament" is used as a proper name without any article. When not the institution in general, but a particular assembly is referred to, the article is proper, as "the Parliament of 1905."

(29) The suffragettes seem to be determined to carry on *the* war to the knife.

There was no previous mention of any *war*, but only of a *movement*, so the definite article is out of place. But even with this correction made, the sentence is somewhat awkward; because the preposition "to" following the verb "carry on" suggests at first that "the knife" is the object and limit of the war.

(30) She urged the necessity of making *the* female education more defined.

Female education at large is intended, so the definite article is out of place. If, instead of the objectionable phrase "female education," the phrase "education of women" had been used, the article would have been right.

(31) Nugent in 1813 addressing the Italians, said: "*The* peoples of Italy, you have groaned long enough, etc."

No article is used with the vocative case.

(32) The year before *the* last.

The use of the article here is logical, but the practice is to say "the year before last."

(33) The event of *the* last week was the debate on the Budget.

"Last week" is here a mere expression of period, and

should not have the article. It would be right to say "the last week" of the year, or of the session, etc., because there the last week is being distinguished from previous weeks.

(34) While admitting that *the* representative Government is the best policy, we cannot overlook. . . .

"Government" is here used in an abstract sense, and the addition of an adjective does not warrant the use of the article. See page 13. When "Government" stands for a concrete governing body the article may either be used or omitted.

(35) The love of athletics has degenerated into a mad craze, and is affecting all *the* classes.

Classes in general are meant—not any particular classes as distinguished from others. The article, therefore, is out of place here. But we sometimes speak of "*the* classes," as distinguished from the masses.

(36) The average assessment on a holding is *the* lightest in Bijapur.

It would be correct to say: "*The* lightest average assessment is . . .," because there a predication would be made as to the lightest average assessment. But that is not so in the text, where the adjective, though in the superlative degree, is used only quantitatively.

SECTION II.—NO ARTICLE USED WHERE THE DEFINITE ARTICLE IS REQUIRED.

(1) Of all things that mortal man bestows his thoughts on the thought of love is one that affects him to the utmost.

Here one particular thought is selected for mention to the exclusion of all others, and therefore the expression should have been "*the* one."

(2) Struggle, struggle was my motto last ten years.

This should be "*the* last ten years" (or "these last, etc.," would do), there being no other last ten years.

(3) A precarious hand-to-mouth existence is prejudicial alike to spiritual, moral, and social development on which depends the stability of a nation.

It should have been "to *the* spiritual, etc.," because the particular development contemplated is described by the last words, "on which depends, etc."

(4) Among the several classes of daughters of India.

It should have been "*the* daughters," because they are particularised by the words "of India."

(5) Request the committee to take necessary steps for providing . . .

It should have been "*the* necessary steps," as the object of them is particularised.

(6) That your memorialists heard with greatest joy that . . .

"Heard with joy" would have been correct, but the joy being defined as the greatest the definite article is needed.

(7) The majority of persons that constitute a nation are either men of middle classes or . . .

It should be "*the* persons," as they are defined as those which constitute a nation.

(8) Imprisonment in civil jail.

"In jail" would be right; but the jail being particularised as the civil one, the definite article is required.

(9) The feeling of fear of God.

The fear in question being defined requires the article.

(10) A request was made to the Holkar to spare him for Baroda State.

The Baroda State being one and individual, the definite article should be used. "For Baroda" would be right, because "Baroda" is a proper name; but "Baroda State" is more than a proper name.

(11) They receive very little of consideration which natural affection secures for the young.

The consideration in question is defined, and the definite article is required.

(12) Recent happenings in Panjab.

The proper name is "The Panjab"—*the* five rivers.

(13) In instituting a comparison between different systems of national training, in order to select one which is most suitable.

This should be "*the* one," as the following superlative makes it particular.

(14) The Samiti has been doing creditable work in furtherance of Swadeshi cause.

This should be "*the* Swadeshi cause," as there is only one.

(15) If free quarters are provided in vicinity of a school.

The vicinity in question is defined, so the definite article is required.

(16) Won with the mighty arm of sword.

(17) To talk of sword in this connection is both unhistorical and impolitic.

"*The* sword" is required. See the rule on page 15.

(18) The stigma that will attach to British name.

Even without the adjective added the word "name" itself particularises, and requires the definite article.

(19) The produce will hardly enable him to pay up Government demand.

Here the noun is still more essentially specific.

(20) Large expensive factories seem to be out of question at present.

"Question" here stands for *the* subject of inquiry or discussion, and so should have the definite article. It is quite right to speak of putting a matter "to question," because "question" is there abstract, and means inquiry from outside the matter in hand.

(21) When gold is ⁄shed from sun.

It should be "*the* sun," as there is only one that concerns us. Grammar should not be sacrificed to metre.

(22) Grievances of which complaints are most frequently heard.

The superlative "most" requires the definite article before "grievances," as it has the effect of defining a particular class.

(23) The anniversary this year will be celebrated with usual eclat.

"With eclat," or "with great eclat," would have been right, but as the degree of eclat is specified by the adjective "usual," we require "with *the* usual eclat."

(24) Swadeshi cry is good, but we have to look at it from all points of view.

A particular cry being mentioned, the definite article should have been put before "swadeshi."

(25) Some arrests have already been made, and prosecutions will soon be commenced in courts.

It should be "*the* courts," the courts being a definite body.

(26) Salt-tax is further reduced.

The salt-tax is a particular thing, and should have the article.

(27) Where temples stand in gardens outside town.

The town is one and particular, and the definite article is required.

(28) A contingency which is not likely to arise in near future.

"In future" would be right, but the attributive "near" makes the definite article necessary.

(29) The difference between the richer classes and masses.

The contrast is between the richer classes and "*the* masses" —not a certain number of masses taken and other masses left, but the one great body of the populace distinguished from the richer classes.

(30) Hindu constitution utterly ignores the idea of the brotherhood of men.

Though the word "constitution" is not concrete in the sense of being material, yet it is not an abstract term, for it is a thing that has been built up. The Hindu Constitution is one and particular, and the definite article is required.

(31) The parties who ought to be most interested were not on record.

"Record" here requires the definite article, as it means the specific file of papers forming the record of a suit.

(32) As soon as he puts his foot on Indian shores.

The Indian shores are concrete and particular, and the definite article is required. Contrast with this the word "soil," as used in example (4), on page 16.

(33) The evil that is wrought to society and to human race.

The human race is one and particular, and the definite article is needed. It might be urged that so also is "society," as here used, one and particular; but the word in its original sense of relationship or fellowship is purely abstract, and it seems to require the same grammatical treatment even when it stands, as in the text, for a concrete community.

(34) It was hoped that Lord Elgin would remind the premiers that British Empire included India.

The concrete British Empire, not abstract British sway, is meant, so the definite article is needed.

(35) There could be nothing more delightful to feed the senses on than "dream in marble."

It should be *the* "dream in marble," as a particular building is referred to.

(36) The Japanese have made wonderful progress, and Japanese language contains an excellent literature.

It should be "the Japanese language," the language being one and particular.

(37) The masses of Indian population are quite ignorant of European culture.

Similarly this should be "of the Indian population."

(38) He gave this advice once last year or year before last.

Here we should have "the year before last," that one year being particularised and separated from all others. It may be said that on the same principle we should also have "*the* last year"; and logically perhaps we should, just as in the case of "last ten years," in example (2) above. But the habit is to say "last year," "last week," "last night," etc., when only a single measurement of time is involved,

and no numeral is used. When, however, the last year is being distinguished from any other year, the use of the article is proper, as "*the* last year of Akbar's reign."

(39) That the Nagar Brahman community wanted to extort Rs.5,000 from the two gentlemen who had been to England is far from truth.

The truth about the facts in question is something specific and particular, and the writer should have said "*the* truth"

(40) The affinities of Bihari language and Bengali indicate the mixed character of the population.

Here "Bihari" is an adjective defining the language in question, and the definite article is required. "Bengali," on the other hand, is a proper noun, and is rightly used without the article.

SECTION III.—THE INDEFINITE ARTICLE USED WHERE NONE IS REQUIRED.

Mistakes under this head are very common, and arise principally from putting the indefinite article before abstract nouns, which is not the English usage. Thus we find:—

(1) He concludes his article with *an* advice to the social reformers that . . .

(2) The volume of which he makes *a* mention.

(3) It brings on too early maternity, which means too early deaths or too weak *a* progeny.

(4) After *a* mature deliberation.

(5) There is *a* vast scope for improvement.

(6) In spite of *an* inclement weather.

(7) Those who seek *a* government employment.

(8) Praying for *a* legislation for the prevention of the practice of polygamy.

(9) The extravagances call for *an* early attention.

(10) The provincial social conference repeats the same tale in *a* different phraseology.

(11) It is nothing short of *a* sacrilege to consign Chaitanya to the genus agitator.

(12) Those who can advance such *a* fallacious reasoning

In all the above instances the article should have been omitted. There are cases in which the mistake is made more natural from the fact that the word used may, when used in another sense, take the indefinite article, so that the foreign ear is accustomed to the combination. Such cases are :—

(13) He died leaving *an* issue.

(14) If the fates ordain the birth of *a* male issue.

(15) Having made *a* rapid progress.

(16) We would have kept silent over it had not the "Englishman" sought to make *a* capital of it.

(17) The portly quarto displays *a* wide reading and much pains.

(18) Go out for *a* travel and come back fifteen years hence.

(19) The excommunication which *a* foreign travel entails.

(20) He showed his spite against the widows in *a* language unworthy of an ascetic.

(21) The sorrows of Hindu widows are depicted in *a* passionate language.

(22) So violent *a* language.

(23) The present chaos in Russia and the only chance of *an* order emerging out of it.

(24) The report is in literary form, and invites *a* study.

(25) There is *a* talk of an additional judge being appointed.

A particular conversation may be spoken of as "*a* talk," but here general rumour seems to be intended.

In the following cases also the article should have been omitted :—

(26) There should be *a* separate bedding for the child.

(27) He comes into the world and goes out of it at the pleasure of another. Who is this *a*nother ?

(28) Female education is making *a* decided headway in Bombay.

(29) You may consider it *a* great luck.

(30) Everything was in *a* chaos.

(31) Perhaps he expected *a* laughter for his wit.

The following are instances of a peculiar English idiom in which the practice is to use no article :—

(32) Mr. Ratiram, *a* worthy son of the sturdy old Durgaram Mehtaji that he is.

(33) The average Englishman, *a* good Christian though he may be.

34) *An* unsympathetic official as he was, he was still broad-minded in reference to public finance.

(35) *A* fervent and most active patriot as he was, the work of social reform was to him not a matter of secondary importance.

(36) *An* orthodox and devout Hindu woman as she was, she would never . . .

Again, with the idiomatic expression, "part and parcel," no article is used. The following require correction :—

(37) This is only *a* part and parcel of the coronation ceremony.

(38) The knowledge of man is only *a* part and parcel of the knowledge of the Infinite.

(39) The number of Hindu Bhaktas who have professed such views is *a* legion.

"*A* legion" seems quite logical, but the practice is to say "legion" only. Perhaps the reason may be that the idiom is derived from a particular narrative of the Christian scriptures, in which an evil spirit, being asked its name, answers, "My name is Legion; for we are many." As a proper name, of course, "Legion" would not take the article; and from "name is legion" we might easily pass to "number is legion." This is, however, only a suggestion.

(40) No more painful *an* example.

The article cannot be thus used with the negative adjective

"no." Indeed, it is already included in "no"; for "no" is "none" or "no one," and "one" is originally identical with the article "an" or "a." But with the negative adverb "never" this article may properly be used, as "never a farthing," "never a soul."

SECTION IV.—NO ARTICLE USED WHERE THE INDEFINITE ARTICLE IS REQUIRED.

(1) The municipalities having to a certain extent proved successful, elective system was introduced into them.

It should be "*an* elective system" (or, if some recognised elective system had been previously mentioned, "*the* elective system").

(2) She invited me to sit down, and offered me betels and smoke.

"Smoke" in the sense of visible vapour is used without the article; but an act of smoking is "*a* smoke."

(3) Mr. Davar had large practice, and there is every reason to hope that he will acquit himself with credit in his high office.

This is perfectly good English, but the use of the word "practice" without an article rather suggests practice in the affairs of life generally. If practice in a particular profession, such as the law, is meant, we should say "*a* large practice."

(4) We have undergone great many difficulties.

It would be right to say "many difficulties," or "very many," without any article; but when an adjective like "great" or "good" precedes the word "many," the latter is a noun and not an adjective, and the article "a" is required. "Many" as a noun means a considerable

number, and suggests a single group or body, however numerous the items composing it may be. That it may be followed by another noun without the interposition of the preposition "of" is possibly due to the fact that the ear is accustomed to the same word (as an adjective) being followed immediately by a noun. When a pronoun follows, the "of" is inserted, as "many of them" (formerly "*a* many of them"). Similarly in the next two examples the article "a" is required before "good many."

(5) The shrine where good many students are still living.

(6) There are good many Muhammadan gentlemen who can. . .

(7) Less than handful delegates.

(8) We see that this continent is governed by handful of civilians.

It should be "a handful."

(9) Punishment to one for the deed of other.

It should be "another." Observe "one" is identical with the article (which is only another form of "one"), but other is merely an adjective.

(10) The Congress should organise itself upon elective basis.

It should be "upon an elective basis."

(11) In order to provide the Congress with proper constitution this year.

It should be "a proper constitution."

(12) During more than quarter of a century.

It should be "a quarter etc."

(13) In view of increasing difficulties in daughter's marriage.

It should be "*a* daughter's marriage." "Difficulties *in the way of* a daughter's marriage," or "difficulties in getting a daughter married," would be better, as the difficulties in

contemplation tend to *prevent* the marriage—they are not difficulties *in* the marriage.

(14) These gentlemen who strike a match from distance and run away before the explosion takes place.

We should say "from *a* distance."

(15) The spread of education is gradually placing all the races of India on equal footing.

It should be "on *an* equal footing."

(16) Until country-made articles are reduced and brought on par with imported goods.

Similarly this should be "on *a* par," though we do say "at par," "above par," "below par."

"FEW" AND "A FEW."

(17) But what must interest us most in India is the suggestion that few Indian Princes or distinguished men in the country should be given seats in the House of Lords.

For "few" we should here have "*a* few." Both are grammatically correct, but the force of each is different, and the distinction requires careful observation. "A few" means simply a small number, but "few" without the article has rather the sense of *only* a small number—that is, a smaller number than might in ordinary course have been expected. "A few people had arrived" implies nothing as to previous expectation; but "few people had arrived" implies that the paucity was noteworthy. So again in Campbell's line:—

Few, few shall part, where many meet!

attention is drawn to the striking fact that though a large number met, only a small number survived to part.

(18) I do not propose to enter into the various aspects of the question, but will content myself with placing before the reader few facts that he may be the better enabled to think over it.

(19) Few years after, he came to Ispahan.

In these two examples, on the contrary, we should have "*a* few facts," "*a* few years."

(20) Mere sentimental wish to go and do likewise cannot avail much.

The indefinite (or, according to the connection, the definite) article is required, because "wish" stands for a concrete desire, not an abstract feeling of desire. Had the word "desire" been used instead of "wish," the article might have been either used or omitted. But "wish" is not so used. For example, we might say, "Desire is an important factor in etc.," but we should not say, "Wish is an important factor in etc."

(21) There was time in Europe when similar institutions. . .

Not time in the abstract, but a particular undefined time is meant; so we should have "There was a time . . ."

(22) The writer might have explained how the agitators worked to convert loyal into disloyal Panjab.

The indefinite article is required before both "loyal" and "disloyal." This may seem exceptional, because "Panjab," as a proper name, would ordinarily take no article. But the idiom is quite logical, because, though there is only one Panjab, the writer deliberately contemplates it in two different possible aspects and so makes two individuals of it.

SECTION V.—THE DEFINITE ARTICLE USED WHERE THE INDEFINITE IS REQUIRED.

(1) A little consideration will make us believe that this is not *the* change which is wrought by mere chance.

Here the writer has not before his eyes any change that is

wrought by mere chance; he sees a change and says it is not of a particular character. He should have written "*a* change."

(2) There has been a storm in *the* tea-pot at Coconada.

The popular expression, "storm in a teapot," does not contemplate any particular teapot.

(3) *The* question is oftentimes asked as to what steps the association is going to take.

As the question is not made definite, the article should be indefinite. It would have been right to say, "The question is often asked: What steps, etc.," because there the question is definite.

(4) The late Swami was *the* resident of a village in the Gujranvala district.

He was not the sole resident, he was only *a* resident.

(5) Perhaps the authorities fear *the* state of things like that which occurred in the first quarter of the last century.

The fear would not be of the identical state of things which occurred in passed time, but only of *a* state of things resembling it.

(6) Mr. Dadabhai is *the* honorary life member of the club.

This is like the last example but one.

(7) The proposed amendment does not affect the Parsis one way or *the* other.

Were two specified ways in question, this would be right. But the statement is quite general, and we do not know how many possible ways there may be. The "the" should be "an." Contrast example (3), page 38.

(8) In Sparta the military discipline was pushed to *the* extreme.

"Extreme," though strictly a superlative (being derived

from the Latin *extremus*, the superlative of *exter*, outward), is not always used as such in English, but is often used to express only a very high degree. Indeed, a new superlative, "extremest," is formed from it. Similarly the noun "extreme" does not always mean the absolute extremity; and in the text above a native writer would say "an extreme," no particular limit being in view.

(9) There is plenty of material from which *the* middle class in India might be manufactured.

The writer's argument being that there is as yet no middle class in India, he should have said "*a* middle class."

(10) The object of the Society is to stretch out *the* helping hand to the man who is down.

We should say "*a* helping hand." This may be contrasted with example (12), on page 93. The distinction would seem to be that the expression "helping hand" suggests rather a concrete individual *act* of aid, while "hand of fellowship" suggests rather the abstract *disposition* to aid.

(11) They were bound to keep Government well informed about the needs of the country . . . but to use violently abusive language against the Government, that was quite *the* different thing altogether.

It should be *a* different thing, as different things are numerous.

(12) *The* deputation like the one proposed can do very useful work.

No definite existing deputation is referred to, but *a* possible one is contemplated.

(13) The sky was perfectly clear, and *the* west wind was blowing.

We speak of "*the* wind" when we mean the air in motion

generally, and regard it as a single entity—just as we speak of "*the* sun." We may also speak of "*the* west wind," when we mean the west wind generally—as, for instance, if we are referring to the character of the wind that blows in that direction, or if we personify it. But when, as in the text, we wish to individualise the wind blowing on a particular occasion, we should use the indefinite article. The following examples illustrate all these variations :—

"The way was long, *the* wind was cold,

"Of a' the airts *the* wind can blaw,
I dearly lo'e *the* west."

"A wet sheet and a flowing sea,
A wind that follows fast."

"*A* good south wind sprung up behind."

(14) *The* incident which contributed in a large measure to the liveliness of the proceedings.

It is not indicated that there was only one such incident, so the indefinite article should have been used. If for "a large" we had "the largest," then "*the* incident" would have been correct.

(15) In a dependency like India, where journalism has not attained *the* high level as in England.

The writer might have said "*the* high level *which* it has obtained in England," for then a particular level would have been defined; but the conjunctional clause "as in England" has no such effect, and the phrase should have been "*a* high level."

SECTION VI.—THE INDEFINITE ARTICLE USED WHERE THE DEFINITE IS REQUIRED.

(1) To work out the reforms in *a* manner least calculated to provoke angry feelings.

It would have been all right to say "in a manner little calculated, etc.," if that would have expressed the meaning intended; but the use of the word "least" restricts the manner in view to one only, and therefore the definite article should have been used.

(2) The scales adopted are a step in *a* direction of acknowledging that we have to take the raiyat as he is.

Here also the direction is particularised by the words which follow it, and so the article should have been definite.

(3) People who have one eye on earth and *a*nother on heaven cannot do much good to the cause of social reform.

As there is only one other eye, the definite article should be used. Contrast example (7), page 35.

(4) This is probably *a* thin end of the wedge.

As there is only one thin end, the definite article should be used.

(5) Mr. Morley, as Secretary of State for India, is *a* right man in the right place.

The figure is of one particular man fitting one particular place, and the definite article is required as much before the one as before the other.

(6) The nature of *an* offspring's physique.

"Offspring," like "issue" and "progeny," is used in an abstract sense, and should take the definite article.

(7) No one can deny that, just now, ours is *a* position of beggars.

This would be right if different positions of beggars were in

contemplation; but the writer is comparing the position of beggars with that of creditors, and so should have used the definite article.

SECTION VII.—AN ARTICLE USED INSTEAD OF A PRONOUN OR ADJECTIVE.

(1) I had a very tempting offer. It was difficult to make up *the* mind.

This is the French idiom, but in English we should say "*my* mind."

(2) The young lady has lost *the* peace of her mind.

Here we should say "her peace of mind"—"peace of mind" being treated as a single word.

(3) The widow re-marriage act and its operation owed *the* initiation to him.

For "the" we should have "their."

(4) It makes it difficult for one to trace the present trouble to *the* source.

We should say "to *its* source."

The next examples are not wrong, but we should rather say "any" than "a."

(5) The Congress has not ventured to ask for *a* representation of the people outside the existing legislative councils.

(6) He attributed it to the absence of *a* need for it.

(7) In the republic of letters caste had not found *a* recognition.

(8) The Shah did not pay *a* scrupulous regard to his limited resources.

CHAPTER III.

ADVERBS.

SECTION I.—ADVERBS COMBINED WITH VERBS SO AS TO ALTER THE MEANING OF THE VERB.

MISTAKES are frequent in the use of those adverbs which when joined to a verb do not qualify the action of the verb but actually add something to its meaning, such as *on, off, up, away*. I will first illustrate the distinction. If the adverb "quickly" be added to the verb "to run," it merely qualifies the action, the manner of the running; but if the adverb "away" be joined to the same verb, the notion of escape is brought in. So "to use a thing carefully" speaks only to the manner of using; but "to use a thing up" implies consumption of it. Our use of these adverbs must often be very puzzling to foreigners. I remember my friend Mr. R. S. Tipnis, late Judge of Thana, who spoke English excellently, was much astonished when he was told that it was incorrect to speak of "tearing a document off," instead of tearing it "up," when it was intended to express that it was torn into pieces. And probably several of the following examples will cause surprise to many readers:—

> (1) He spoke as a moralist, and *gave* himself *away* to the sombre reflection how all empires, however great, have in the past decayed and fallen.

To "give one's self away" is a colloquial expression meaning to betray one's self, to let slip some thought which it was intended to keep secret, or by some act or word to show an intention not meant to be divulged. The expression

required in the text is to "give one's self *up*," in the sense of devoting one's self.

(2) It is wise in a tropical country to *marry away* girls before they reach the age of puberty.

If any adverb be used here, it should be "off" and not "away."

(3) The time has *gone by* when the highest duty of the Government consisted in imparting European science and literature.

This use of "by" after the verb "to go" rather suggests some opportunity lost, as "The time has gone by when you might have helped him." The text would be better with the "by" omitted.

(4) Nearly fifteen years have *passed by* since that Act was passed.

To "pass by" suggests neglect or overlooking. Of the mere lapse of time we should rather say that it "passes," or, if it be desired to dwell upon the loss, that it "passes away."

(5) Every boy or girl was asked to *pick up* the flower he or she liked. I selected a rose.

To "pick up" means to take up (as from the ground, etc.), and conveys no sense of *choosing* as "pick" by itself would, and as is required here.

(6) A gentleman *picked up* a rose and put it to his nose.

No doubt the writer means that the man "picked," or gathered, the rose—not that he picked it *up*.

(7) A decision to which we must *bow down*.

To "bow down," followed by the preposition "to," is used only in reference to some object of reverence, usually a physical object. The verb required here is to "bow."

(8) We cannot *put down* the discontent of to-day to the impoverishment of the people.

The effect of placing "down" immediately after "put" is to suggest that it is an adverb qualifying the verb. But here there is no question of *putting down* discontent, but only of attributing it to a certain cause. The "down" should come after "to-day."

(9) The orthodox did not wish to move an inch outside the *worn out* groove.

The verb "wear" seems to be used here in the sense of to cause by attrition, as we speak of water *wearing* a channel in the ground. But the addition of the adverb "out" changes this meaning altogether—"worn out" means exhausted, or spoilt by wear.

(10) They found little difficulty in *breaking* the opposition.

Here, contrary to the last example, the verb requires an adverb. We do not say "break opposition," but "break down opposition."

(11) Witnesses who did not *break* in cross-examination.

Here also, with the same verb used intransitively, the adverb "down" is required.

(12) The Bengal ryots, when trodden by the oppression of the indigo planters, refused to touch indigo seed.

After "trodden," also, "down" is required.

(13) The Congress was presided over by Mr. Dadabhai, who was *brought down* from England specially for the purpose. . .

For "down" we should say "out." We may speak of a man being brought down from town—perhaps because towns were formerly built usually upon hills.

(14) Exchange *falls down*.

We say exchange "falls." But if the point to which it

falls is to be expressed, it would be right (though not necessary) to say "falls down" to that point.

(15) Healthy ideas of this kind are now gathering in strength, and in their greater and more widespread influence must be read the real advance of the country.

Does the writer mean that the ideas are gathering (intransitive) in (preposition) strength—that is to say, collecting in numbers? Or does he mean that they are gathering (transitive) in (adverb) strength—that is, assuming strength? If the latter, it would have been better to say only "gathering strength," though with a different object, such as "the harvest," it would be right to say "gather in."

(16) Does he administer the oath in the same way as an interpreter *swears in* a witness?

To "swear *in*" is confined to induction into an office. We say to "swear a witness."

(17) Officials *sticking up* to prepossessed ideas.

(18) He scrupulously *stuck up* to tradition.

This should be "stuck to tradition." To "stick up to" is a slang expression for to withstand—used of a weaker or smaller person or power withstanding a greater one.

(19) To *spot out* the weak points.

We never say to "spot out." To "spot" is a colloquial term for "to point out." The writer has mixed up the two expressions.

(20) I may not like to fast and *draw* my boots.

"Draw" is a translation of one of the common Indian words used in connection with the removal of boots from the feet. If used, it should be followed by the adverb "off"; but a native would rather say "take off" in connection with boots.

(21) The story opens with the stealthy landing of the German army, and the *cutting off* of telegraph wires.

Of course, a piece of wire may be cut *off*, but what is meant here is obviously the *cutting* of the wires to break the connection of place with place.

(22) Though outwardly he *showed off* his contentment, he cherished in the inmost recesses of his bosom the deadliest hatred.

To "show off" means to display ostentatiously, but it does not convey the sense of making an appearance of something which does not really exist. The "off" should be omitted. So also should the pronoun "his."

(23) As soon as petitioning was *resolved*, the futility of boycott was admitted.

We have Milton's authority for this use of the word "resolve," but in these days we should say "resolved *on*."

(24) Mechanical and scientific appliances are rapidly improving and *killing out* primitive and smaller industries.

We say to "kill *off*," not to "kill *out*." It would be right, however, to speak of the industries as "*dying out*."

(25) He *passed out* his B.A. this year.

This should be "He passed his B.A.," the word "examination" being understood. Or using "pass out" intransitively we might say "He passed out *as* B.A."

(26) He also *pointed* the folly of depending too much on agriculture.

"Pointed out" is obviously meant. "Pointed the folly" is a possible expression, but it would not mean that he indicated the existence of the folly, but that he said something that added point or piquancy to the already contemplated folly, as in Johnson's line:—

"To point a moral or adorn a tale."

"FIND" AND "FIND OUT."

(27) The corpses have not yet been all *found out* and disposed of.

It is often optional to say either "find" or "find out." But there are occasions when only the one or the other is proper. To "find" ordinarily means merely to discover, whether by accident or upon search; but to "find out" ordinarily means to discover something which has been intentionally concealed or kept hidden. To *find* a problem means merely to come across a problem; to *find out* a problem means to discover the solution of it. So to *find* a man means merely to discover him; to *find* him *out* means to discover his true character, or to detect some fault in him. [Observe in the other sense of finding a man out, namely finding him not at home, the "out" does not qualify the verb "find" at all, but is used with the force of an adjective qualifying the object.] In the passage above "found" would be better than "found out." So also in the following:—

(28) He found *out* that there is little or no variation in the lengths of certain bones.

(29) It will then be found *out* that what is thought and prepared for is obtained.

(30) If we studied the causes of our past failures, we should invariably find *out* that etc.

(31) The idea is expressed in an official report, to find *out* which, at the time of legislation, is a matter of great difficulty.

(32) It is difficult to find *out* from recent vernacular literature any other such incident.

(33) The work of the Chamber will be to find *out* means.

(34) Several of these letters were afterwards found *out*.

(35) Mr. Baij Nath rightly advises his patriotic countrymen to find *out* means of supplying the needs of the people.

(36) Difficulties will arise in finding *out* a suitable husband.

(37) There are other disputes which we must find *out* other means of composing.

(38) The objects of this Association will be found *out* at page 3 of the report.

(39) The reader will easily find *out* from the above extracts that Raja Ram Mohan Rai was a whole-hearted follower of Jesus Christ.

(40) His sayings and writings are quoted as if they were the oracles of a Mahatma, while those of representative Indians who have laboured for the country's good for scores of years are passed in silence.

Authority may be found for this use of the word "pass," but any modern writer would say here "are passed *over* in silence."

(41) Information on this point should be *collected together*.

To "collect together" is not said of an abstract noun like "information," but only of concrete items. Even then the "together" is superfluous, the meaning being already expressed in the prefix of the verb.

(42) Widows should be *gathered* in houses specially established for them.

Here, on the contrary, the adverb "together" is needed.

(43) How soon, how late, depends upon us: if we *pull up* and work it will be sooner than we think.

To "pull up" (intransitive) means almost the opposite of what is intended here; it means to halt or stop, and is used primarily of stopping a horse by pulling the reins. The writer would rather seem to mean to press forward—to make an effort. He might have used the colloquial expression, "pull ourselves together." It is true that in the streets of London the expression "pull up" may be heard in the sense of going forward—that is, when a stationary vehicle is ordered to move a little forward. It is a curiosity of language that the same expression "pull up" as addressed to the driver of a vehicle tells him to stop if his carriage be moving, and to move forward if it be stationary.

(44) The sub-castes must be fused, and the backward classes *pulled up*.

To "pull up" (transitive) means to pluck up, to tear up, as by the roots; but the writer evidently means almost the opposite of this. He might have said "raised up" or "brought forward."

(45) There are great barriers *making up* for disunion.

To "make up" has many meanings—to compose, to fabricate, to supplement, etc.; but here the proper expression is "making for," without the adverb "up."

(46) The *fostering up* of a national spirit.

The "up" should be omitted.

(47) In the matter of *starting up* agricultural associations.

"Up" is used with to "start" in its intransitive sense to convey the idea of suddenly rising from a seat or any low position; but it has no force as used in the text with the transitive verb.

(48) He has *lit up* the fire of reform.

To "light up" means to throw light upon, as by a torch, fire, etc.; but of the torch or fire itself we say "light," and not "light *up*."

(49) The example of Calcutta should be *followed up*.

There are English writers who speak of following up an example, but I question if the expression is correct. To say the least of it, the "up" is meaningless and adds no force to the verb in this connection. But to "follow up" has special senses of its own. It may mean (1) to pursue closely, as "to follow up a trail"; or (2) to reinforce by further action something already done, as "The Romans followed up their success by an attack on Olbia," or "I

do not pretend to say where she would have stopped if she had followed up this step with others of a similar character."

(50) The litigation might *take up* ten years.

A native would omit the "up" here. It is true we often speak of taking *up* time, but that is always with a sense that the time so occupied is wanted for something else—not when mere duration of time is intended. In fact, to "take up" when used of time involves a personal element—some person's time is taken up. For example, "The painting of the picture *took* a year, and *took up* nearly all the painter's time."

(51) You thus *hold* to ridicule the reforms suggested.

This should be "hold *up* to ridicule." To "hold" by itself conveys no sense of exhibiting, to "hold *up*" does. This relates, of course, to the transitive verb to "hold"; with the intransitive the force of "up" is quite different, to "hold up" meaning to keep up one's fortitude; or, in regard to the weather, to keep fine, and so on.

SECTION II.—ADVERBS IN OTHER CASES.

(1) The Svadeshi movement is thus receiving the active co-operation of Government in the extreme west of India. There is no reason why the same state of things should not obtain *all over*.

"All over," when used as an adverb of place, requires some indication of the area covered, as "his body was bruised all over." In the passage above it might be used as a preposition with the word "India" added; or "everywhere" might be substituted.

(2) Every reformer has had to feel his *almost* impotence in battling with these forces.

"Almost" is never an adjective. "Almost absolute impo-

tence" would do, or "feel himself almost impotent."

(3) We have followed the development of the scheme *almost* since it was originated.

"Almost since" is awkward, because "since" draws attention to the end, as well as to the beginning, of the time in question, while "almost" is meant to refer to the beginning only and not to the end. "Almost from the day . . ." would be all right, for there the intended force of "almost" is clear. A similar example follows :—

(4) The Bengal Social Reform Association has not been able to do anything *almost ever since* its formation.

(5) Start really useful papers, and improve those *already extant.*

"Already extant," though etymologically correct, strikes oddly on the native ear, because "already" conveys the sense of "*by* this time," while extant (as now used) means "existing *up to* this time." The two cannot well be combined. We might say either "already existing" or "still extant."

(6) It was very cold, and I suffered much for want of warm clothing. However, I reached Vancouver *anyhow,* and thence through Canada to Chicago.

It may be inferred from the context that the writer means "somehow," not "anyhow." As to the difference between "any" and "some," see under Adjectives, page 98. "Anyhow" conveys the sense of "At the cost of disregarding all other considerations"; "somehow" that of "In spite of all difficulties."

(7) Those conditions which are holding us *backwards.*

For "backwards" we should have "back." The two adverbs, though often interchangeable, are not identical in meaning. The addition of the suffix "wards" fortifies the

sense of direction of motion, while "back" is consistent with a stationary position. You may say "Go back," or "Go backwards," but only "Stand back," and not "Stand backwards."

(8) We deplore the greater concentration now than some years *before*.

The abverb "before," when used of time, requires reference to some point, or date, or event, marking the antecedence of the time in question. When distance of time is to be expressed without any such reference, the proper adverb is "ago." So also is the next:—

(9) The tone of the Indian papers is not as respectful towards the British Government as it was five years *before*.

(10) Mr. Morley appreciates the heart and whatever proceeds from that source, *better* than he prizes the head.

"Better" goes well with "appreciate," but not with "prize"; for to appreciate implies the exercise of discrimination, but to prize does not. Appreciation is a matter of judgment, which may be good or bad; but to prize is only a matter of personal predilection—the value set may be high or low, but cannot be said to be good or bad. "More" would go with either verb, as it is expressive only of degree or quantity.

(11) It is the Bengalis who have *but* begun to rise as a people.

The context shows that what the writer means is, "It is only the Bengalis who have begun to rise as a people." The mistake is not in using "but" instead of "only," but in the position of the adverb, which, being put in the relative clause, is made to qualify the verb. Observe, we may say either "only the Bengalis" or "the Bengalis only"; but if "but" is used, it must precede the noun.

(12) The English nation is *by far and away* the strongest and the best arbiter.

"By far" is correct, and "far and away" is an allowable colloquialism; but the two expressions cannot be combined. For "away" is a shortened form of "on way," and so itself contains a preposition, and we could not say "by on way."

(13) In struggles between priests and kings it is *generally* the latter that *always* win.

The two adverbs somewhat contradict one another, as "generally" means "usually but not always." A similar mistake occurs in the next example:—

(14) He has taken *absolutely* no measures *worth mentioning* to allay the unrest.

This is not grammatically wrong, but it is inapt to use together two phrases one expressive of degree and the other denying all degree.

(15) Mr. Morley is *hardly several* months in office.

We can say "hardly a year" (or any such definite period), but we cannot apply this adverb to such an indefinite adjective as "several." "Hardly" suggests an approximation to some definite *limit*, *line*, or *point*.

(16) A few days *hence* the owner of the tree came to the spot.

This should be "a few days later." "Hence" is never measured from past time but from the time of speaking.

(17) A task always difficult, and *highly* more so in the present case.

"Highly" cannot appropriately qualify "more," for the latter is expressive merely of quantity, and not of any particular kind of quantity, while the former is a figurative term. "Much" is the proper word in the text.

(18) They have been *intensely more* religious than all their critics.

"Intensely" carries an association of depth or keenness, and is seldom used except with a word expressive of some kind of feeling—never with a word like "more," which expresses comparison only.

(19) We know Mr. Aiyar *more* than our contemporary does.

Instead of "more" here we should have "better." It would be right to say "We know more of Mr. Aiyar," but the meaning would be different, conveying that we know more of his circumstances, not that we know the man better. It would also be right to say "We know more Greek than etc." In this last instance "more" is an adjective; in the previous one it is a noun; in the extracted instance it is an adverb.

(20) What is *more* known to a child than his daily experiences?

Here also a native would write "better" not "more."

(21) The language which pays *most* is learnt.

This is perhaps allowable, but we should rather say "pays *best.*" "Pays most" might be the transitive verb with the noun "most" as its object, *e.g.*, "That master pays most." "Pays best" is clearly the intransitive verb with the adverb "best."

(22) The honour which he is so *much* proud of.

The adverb "much" is not now used to qualify an adjective, except one in the comparative degree, or (with "the" added) in the superlative, as "much better," or "much the best." For use with adjectives in the positive degree "very" has now taken the place of "much." But the latter is largely used with past participles, as "much pleased."

(23) The cause of education is as *much* sacred and religious as renewing old temples.

(24) Things which make her life not *much* worth living.

(25) How *much* are our women foreign to the delightful quiet . . .

In these cases also the "much" should be omitted before the adjectives.

(26) That the ladies themselves should plead for social reforms ought to be very *much* encouraging.

As regards the use of "much," *present* participles are treated as adjectives (though past participles are frequently preceded by "much").

(27) There were *nearly quite* as many women as men.

This is not a happy combination; the one adverb expressing approximation to a certain point, and the other complete arrival at that point.

(28) The Chief had a summer house about two miles *off* from the town.

"About two miles off" by itself would be right; but before a prepositional phrase like "from the town" we should say "away" and not "off." There would be no objection to a prepositional phrase following "off" when that word qualifies a preceding verb; for example, "to cut off from the land of the living." Perhaps the explanation may be that in the latter case as soon as the "off" is reached it is known to be an adverb qualifying the verb already expressed; whereas in a passage like the one above, the "off," when it is first heard or meets the eye, may be taken to be a preposition, and the mind may be led to expect its object. With the use of "away" no such confusion can arise, because "away" is never a preposition.

(29) The mixture in public meetings is *only quite* a formal affair.

"Only quite" is an awkward combination—it sounds as if the "only" qualified the "quite," though, in fact, the force of the one adverb is quite independent of that of the other.

(30) They must not claim credit for what they do. *On the other hand* they must learn to efface themselves.

The two expressions "Not to claim credit," and "To efface oneself," represent conduct of a similar tendency; and therefore to put the adverbial phrase "On the other hand" between them is wrong—they are both on the same hand. It may seem strange that though "On the other hand" is not allowable here, "On the contrary" would be perfectly suitable. The reason is that "On the other hand" at the beginning of the second sentence pre-supposes "On the one hand" at the beginning of the first, and therefore the *whole* of the first sentence (including the negative) must be taken into view; whereas with "On the contrary" the claiming of credit, which is forbidden, is merely contrasted with the effacement which is prescribed.

(31) All our great wars were forced upon us; they were not of our own seeking. *On the other hand*, no efforts were spared to avoid them.

This is similar to the last example.

(32) The articles appearing in their columns *so* off and on.

The adverb "so," which, as used here, means in a high degree, cannot appropriately be applied to the phrase "off and on"; for "off" and "on" have opposite meanings, and there is no force in intensifying them both.

(33) Owing to want of proper information from Chittagong, I was not *so long* in a position to explain the matter.

The writer then proceeds to explain the matter. This shows

that the "I was" is the common mistake (see page 131) of using the past tense for the perfect "I have been," and that what the writer means is "I have not been till now in a position etc." Instead of "till now" he might say "so far," but not "so long."

(34) The case of the prarthana samajists, who have married widows, is not *so altogether* beyond the pale of Hinduism.

The adverbs "so" and "altogether" cannot be thus conjoined, for the one expresses degree while the other negatives the notion of degree. "So utterly" would do, for "utterly" while implying a great extreme does not preclude all comparison.

(35) Partly owing to climatic causes, but more *so* to the genius of our national civilisation.

The "so" should be omitted. There is nothing antecedent with which it can make a comparison or show a resemblance. That the one cause is greater than the others is expressed by the word "more," and there is no question of manner involved.

(36) The cause of the victory is not merely the patriotic devotion of the Japanese, but also, and much more *so*, their humility

This is similar to the last example. The "so" should be omitted, or "in much larger measure" substituted for "much more so." Observe that if any word expressive of manner, measure, or degree had gone before, then "more so" would be correct; but that not being so, some such word remains to be expressed. The errors are analogous to those noted under "do so," at page .

"STILL" AND "YET."

A good deal of difficulty is found by Indian writers in making the proper distinction between the adverbs "still"

and "yet," when each is used in the sense of "up to the present time." Of course, each of these words has other senses in which their use presents no difficulty. For instance, no one would think of substituting "yet" for "still" in Keats's lines :—

> "Still, still to hear her tender taken breath,
> And so live ever—or else swoon to death";

or "still" for "yet" in Milton's

> "Yet once more, O ye laurels, and once more."

And again there are many occasions on which either word might be used indifferently, as in Coleridge's lines :—

> "Life is but thought: so think I will
> That Youth and I are housemates still";

or in Byron's "Isles of Greece" :—

> "Eternal summer gilds them yet,
> But all, except their sun, is set."

But the difficulty comes in where, while both words mean "up to the present time," there is yet a slight difference in what is connoted by the one word or the other. When we speak or think of a thing or condition continuing up to the present time, there is necessarily present to the mind the possibility (or it may be the impossibility—but at least the question) of its not continuing any longer. And the difference between "still" and "yet" seems to be that in using the first the mind is more fixed on the fact of continuation or duration, while the use of "yet" allows a larger share of attention to a coming change. Now when a negative is used in connection with continuing condition, and instead of speaking of the old condition as still continuing, we speak of the new condition as not having yet begun, naturally the latter (as being the one mentioned) is the more salient object

of thought, and therefore the adverb to be used is "yet" and not "still." The following passages are therefore wrong:—

(37) One sees that social reform is not *still* well understood in its aim.

(38) You are not *still* opening your eyes.

(39) The long staple cotton required for the higher counts of yarn is not *still* grown in India.

But observe that by transposition of the negative in any such sentences the adverb "still" may be retained. For the negation of the new condition gives us the old condition, and we may correctly speak of it as "still" continuing. Thus, instead of saying that social reform is "not yet well-understood," we might say that it is "still not well-understood."

Now in the next example:—

(40) Society is *yet* unready to cope with the call of reform.

"Unreadiness to cope etc.," is the old condition which the writer regards as continuing, and he should therefore have said "is *still* unready." He might have mentioned the new condition positively, and then have said "is not *yet* ready."

(41) The number of girls receiving secondary education is *yet* too small to be taken into account.

Similarly here the "yet" should be "still"; or the writer might have said "not yet large enough."

Another class of cases in which "yet," and not "still," is the proper adverb is when the clause is introduced by some word having the sense of "before," as in Campbell's lines:—

"The gladsome current of our youth
Ere passion yet disorders,
Steals lingering like a river smooth
Along its grassy borders."

And the reason is the same as in the case of the negative, namely, that it is the new condition that is mentioned, and is therefore the more forcibly present to the mind.

(42) But, unfortunately, those who have yet come forward as Theosophists have most of them shown a lust, so to say, after Hinduism.

We should here say "as yet." This form is even more suggestive of coming change than the single "yet," and is specially used in relation to events when more of the same kind are expected to follow. For example, "This comet has appeared only twice as yet"; "They have as yet collected only Rs. 100."

(43) France is quietly watching the development of Anglo-Russian relations—just *yet*.

"Yet" does sometimes mean *at* (and not *up to*) the present time, but in that sense seems to be only used with a negative. In the text we should have "just now."

(44) My financial position had by this time improved so *well* that . . .

Here we should say "much" instead of "well." The verb "improve" has already expressed the *nature* of the change, and only the *degree* remains to be expressed by the adverb.

CHAPTER IV.

PREPOSITIONS.

SECTION I.—PARTICULAR PREPOSITIONS REQUIRED AFTER PARTICULAR VERBS.

IN the following cases the verb used requires a particular preposition to follow, but a wrong one has been employed :—

(1) Had the Indian *devoted* sufficient care *on* his children.

It would have been correct to say " bestowed care on," but the verb " devote," being connected with the word " vow," requires " to " as the preposition.

(2) They *devoted* their time *in* hearing . . .

Here again the preposition must be " to," though it would have been right to say " they spent their time *in* . . ."

(3) Leading men are coming forward to *devote* themselves *for* the solution of the Hindu-Musalman problem.

(4) People inclined to *devote* any portion of their time *for* public work.

Here a third preposition " for " is used instead of the " to " which " devote " requires.

(5) It was resolved that a deputation be asked to wait on His Excellency. We are not aware of the deputation having *waited* as resolved.

To " wait on a person " means to visit him, and this sense of the verb to " wait " is so far removed from its more ordinary sense that the act of paying the visit cannot be expressed by the verb alone without the preposition, as is done in the text.

(6) He was *invited for* dinner.

To " invite " also requires the preposition to be " to."

(7) We do not pretend to *judge on* these questions.

We say to judge " of." It would be right, however, to say " pass judgment *on*. . . ."

(8) Regiments that had *prided themselves* hitherto *that the* services of the recruiting officers were never required.

The reflexive verb to " pride oneself " requires to be followed by " on " or " in " before the object of the pride. The words " on the fact " should be inserted before the " that."

(9) He also *warned* us *from* the bad side of capitalism.

To " warn " takes " of " before the object of danger, or " off " if that object be a place.

(10) The best social idea each household may *aspire for*.

To " aspire " requires " to " before the object aimed at, the prefix *ad* meaning " to."

(11) There was another disadvantage *from* which the system of Boards *laboured*.

The " from " should be " under."

(12) Or does Mr Haldane *taunt* Mr. Morley *for* not having made up his mind.

" With " is the appropriate preposition after to " taunt."

(13) I have to *congratulate* you *for* having secured . . .

(14) This conference *congratulates* the Vanik Mahajan of Surat *for* solving the question of foreign travel for themselves.

" On," or " upon," is the proper preposition. We should say " upon its solution of," or " upon its having solved. . . ."

(15) The " Saturday Review " has been *complaining against* the existing copyright law.

The common idiom is to use the preposition " of " after

to "complain," especially when the object of the complaint is a thing, not a person.

(16) Social reform had always to *combat against* opposition.

To "combat," when used intransitively, requires "with" as the preposition—the prefix *com* or *con* meaning "with." This verb can also be used transitively, as "to combat opposition."

(17) So as to *deter* them *in* the proper discharge of their duties.

The verb "deter" requires the preposition "from," because the prefix *de* means *from*. The use of "deter" implies that the interference was successful, so that the duties were not discharged. Were the interference less it would have been right to say "hampered *in* the discharge of their duties."

(18) The mission which your majesty has been pleased to *confide in* me.

To "confide" when used intransitively takes "in" before the person trusted; but when used transitively, as in the text, the proper preposition is "to."

(19) The manual *treats* exhaustively *on* this fell disease.

For "on" we should have "of."

(20) The people of this district have never *wavered from* their loyalty.

The verb "waver" implies movement of a kind, yet not movement from one place to another, but only to and fro. The preposition should be "in."

(21) It *presented* them the long-wished opportunity.

(22) Japan *presents* us a striking instance of the value of renunciation.

The verb to "present" has two distinct forms of use—to present a thing *to* a person, or to present a person *with*

a thing. But it cannot be used (as the verb to "give" can) with both thing and person in the objective case.

(23) The independent ryot is likely to be *merged into* the crowd of labourers.

To "merge," whether used transitively or intransitively, always takes the preposition "in." The figure is rather of something being gradually lost *in* its existing surroundings than of any motion *into* them.

(24) Hence its *consent with* an anthropomorphic god.

Contrary to the general rule that the preposition used after a verb tallies with the prefix that is part of the verb, to "consent" takes the preposition "to," though *con* means "with."

(25) Could we admire its beauty less when we *contrast* it *to* the dull lines that . . .

To "contrast" requires "with" as the following preposition.

(26) The Secretary of State had his attention *called on* the Bengal partition.

We speak of fixing attention *on*, but of calling attention *to*.

(27) Writing materials should be *provided to* poor children.

The prefix *pro* means "for," and that is the preposition required here.

(28) A municipality may not always see eye to eye with the Government, and may care to *stand up to* its rights.

To "stand up to" means to confront or withstand. In the text any of the following forms would do: "Stand up for," "stand upon," or "stand to its rights."

(29) The most extraordinary powers were *vested with* the Irish executive.

The verb "vest," when thus used, requires the preposition

"in" after it. Or, using the verb in its more literal sense (as to clothe), the sentence might be inverted thus: "The Irish executive were invested with the most extraordinary powers."

(30) It is not possible to *guess of* its composition and character.

Here "at" is the proper preposition.

SECTION II.—PREPOSITIONS IN OTHER CASES.

"ABOUT."

(1) He had made a very keen search *about* the girl.

Before the object of a search "for" is the proper preposition. "About" may be used of the place of search, as "to search about the town."

"AGAINST."

(2) We have a positive objection *against* this work.

Here the more usual preposition is "to," though the prefix *ob* suggests "against."

(3) No one need make much complaint *against* this.

We may speak of a complaint *against* a person, but the preposition before the thing complained of should be "of."

"AMONG."

(4) Barbarian chiefs and barons carved out *among* themselves the fairest portions.

There is no sense of distribution in the verb "carve out," so the preposition should not be "among" but "for."

"AT."

(5) They stealthily approached the village *at* some distance.

"At" will not do after "approach." We might say "approached to within some distance of the village," but the statement is a remarkably vague one.

(6) ~~It is conveniently thrown in at the teeth of Indian patriots.~~

The idiom is "thrown in the teeth."

"BENEATH."

(7) It is entirely *beneath* the point to say. . . .

The idiom is "~~*beside* the point~~."

"BETWEEN."

(8) Even if all the re-married Brahman, Kshatriya, and Vaishya families of various tribes and races may lunch together, there is very little cohesion *between* them.

"Between" is not used of more than two persons or things (~~*tween* being a form of *twain* or two~~). The proper preposition here is "~~among~~."

"BY."

(9) Did the Cabinet permit their policy to be influenced *by* a jot by the decision of their predecessors.

"Jot" is expressive of degree or quantity, not of instrument, so the preposition should be omitted.

"FOR."

(10) Prevent the Marathas from performing any other rites *for* which they may take a fancy.

We speak of "having" a fancy for, but of "taking a fancy *to*."

(11) We cannot but admire his wonderful moral courage *for* having performed it.

The "for" should be "in."

(12) It is extremely gratifying *for* me to note . . .

The "for" should be "to."

(13) The Universities were founded without any consideration *for* the difference in manners, customs, etc.

(14) The amount payable is fixed without any consideration *for* the means of the bride's parent.

We speak of consideration *of things* that have to be taken

into account, *for persons* whose interests have to be regarded.

(15) This young man had already lost his first wife, and was being pressed by his people *for* re-marriage.

"For" is wrong here. We should say "pressed to re-marry."

(16) The arrangements *for* an important public function.

The arrangements *for* a function are the steps necessary to bring it about; the details prescribed for its conduct would be called the arrangements *of* the function.

(17) The speaker thanked Dr. Rukhmabai for the great trouble she had taken *for* organising that gathering.

The "for" should be "in."

(18) His objections *for* adopting the definition. . . .

The "for" should be "to."

(19) There is no chance *for* an increase in the number of readers.

"Chance," in the sense of opportunity, may be followed by "for" before the person to whom the opportunity is available; but in the sense of probability it is followed by "of."

"FROM."

(20) Many of the utterances of the week, beginning *from* the presidential address.

The "from" should be "with." This is logical, because the first item of a series does not merely mark a starting point, but is itself a part of the series.

(21) The view which, originating *from* Hobbes, and handed down through Locke, permeated . . .

Here also the "from" should be "with."

"IN" AND "INTO."

When the preceding verb conveys the sense of movement of the object, or of change in its condition, the following preposition (introducing the new place or condition) should be "into" rather than "in." Thus we say, "He was *in* the world," but "he came *into* the world"; "he was *in* a rage," but "he got *into* a rage." In the following fifteen examples the "in" should be changed to "into."

(22) To bring the Government *in* touch with the people.
(23) So that they may be brought *in* the pale of education.
(24) He called the girl *in* the witness box.
(25) Push me *in* the immortal world of peace and virtue.
(26) Ere I step *in* the domain of peace.
(27) Political agitation was introduced *in* India.
(28) To throw *in* the shade.
(29) To bring *in* use the system of arbitration.
(30) Go out *in* foreign countries.
(31) If he really falls *in* the hands of disloyal men.
(32) The most violent statements have found their way *in* the columns of his paper.
(33) The agitators are too shrewd to take the law *in* their own hands.

The "in" should be "into," as the sense of transfer or movement is involved. Compare with this the expression "take in hand," which means to undertake, and involves no sense of transfer or movement of anything from one place to another.

(34) It will not do to play *in* the hands of interested persons.

Here, also, the notion of transfer is involved—the giving of the advantage to another person.

(35) By pouring new wine *in* old bottles.

"Pour *in*" (the "in" being here an adverb, not a prepo-

sition) is said of the liquid poured, but "pour *into*" (preposition) of the vessel that receives it.

(36) We translate this letter *in* English and publish it here.

This should be "*into* English," as the act of translation is mentioned. It would be right to say a "translation *in* English," the translation being regarded as completed.

Some instances of the opposite character follow.

(37) The English people never called *into* question that impious act.

We say to call *in* question, not *into* question, because the expression means only to doubt, or to challenge, and does not convey any sense of movement, as to "call" does in example (24) above.

(38) The child makes its appearance *into* the world.

Here, no doubt, a sense of movement is involved, but this is dominated by the word "appearance," which requires "in."

(39) The "rab" is then placed *into* vessels called "kalsis."

This is similar: movement is involved, but the verb to "place" fixes attention rather on the final position than on the movement to it, and so "in" is required. With a verb like to "throw," or to "put," it would be different.

(40) The Nawab has involved himself *into* debt.

Here, also, the preposition should be "in," the verb meaning to roll or wrap up in something, and not expressing change of place.

(41) The machinery provided by the law could be easily put into motion.

(42) The agitation set *into* motion has been well justified.

Setting machinery in motion, again, does not imply change of place.

Some other misuses of the preposition " in " follow.

(43) We are glad to learn that preparations are being made *in* the same line as we suggested.

The *in* here should be *on*. The two expressions " in the line " and " on the line " (line in both cases meaning course or direction), are differently used. If the line is something prescribed, or suggested, or adopted as an example we speak of acting *on* that line; but if the line be an established course, we may speak of doing something *in* that line.

(44) *In* its last gasp.

The " in " should be " at."

(45) Hundreds of our young men seek admission *in* our various law colleges.

The " in " should be " to "; the prefix " ad " means " to "; and " admission " implies change of position.

(46) It spoke volumes in favour of those who brought the institution *in* its present state.

The " in " should be either " to " or " into."

(47) The forces which make for the uplifting of the race are ranged on the side *in* which he is working.

The " in " should be " on."

(48) The associations should be asked to contribute *in* this cause.

" To " is the usual preposition in this connection.

(49) His coverlet was torn *in* rags.

The idiom is " tear *to* rags."

(50) Boots and shoes made *in* the best English firms.

The " in " should be " by." This mistake no doubt arises from the Indian habit of using the same word for " shop " and " firm," as *pedi* in Gujarati.

(51) The dasara was celebrated *in* great eclat.

This would suggest that the brilliance was something out side the celebration; the idiom is "*with* great eclat."

(52) Those *in* the lowest rung of the ladder.

A man stands "on," not "in" the rung of a ladder.

(53) Government will find it *in* their own interest to seek our co-operation.

The "in" should be "to." The two expressions, "*in* their own interest," and "*to* their own interest" have not the same force. It would be correct to say "Government will *in* their own interest *seek* etc."; but if we have regard to what they will *find* to be advantageous, we must use the preposition "to."

(54) The presence of nach women was a mistake, and those that *smuggled* them *into the occasion* were guilty of a serious error.

"Occasion" here means an event or occurrence, and as such we cannot speak of smuggling anybody *into* it. We might say "smuggled them in *on* the occasion," the phrase "on the occasion" here having no bearing on the action of the verb; and "in" being an adverb combining with the verb (see page 40).

"OF."

(55) Do they seriously hope *of* national unity?

The noun "hope" may be followed by "of" before the object hoped for, but the verb requires "for."

(56) There is no good *of* passing resolutions which will be ignored.

With the definite article before the noun (good), the "of" would be correct—what is the good etc.? There the "of" introduces a description of the good in question. But when

it is denied that there is any good in a thing, or asserted that there is only a certain amount of good in it, the preposition "in" is required.

(57) If they wish well *of* India.

The idiom is "wish well *to*. . . ."

(58) The peculiar conservative nature of the Hindus would have to be worked upon with an equally powerful earnestness *of* the leaders.

Instead of the last *of*, we require *on the part of*. It would be quite good English to speak of "the earnestness *of* the leaders" as a necessary factor; but we cannot say "*an* earnestness of the leaders," because the earnestness contemplated is a single entity.

(59) I know *of* Prince Salim too well to expect *of* such a thing from him.

This should be either "I know Prince Salim too well," or "I know too *much* of Prince Salim," according to the meaning intended. The "of" after "expect" is wrong, the verb requiring the "such a thing" as its object.

(60) Modern aspirations *of* larger political rights.

The "of" should be "to" or "for."

(61) Urdu authors are not behindhand *of* their Gujarati and Marathi brethren in giving advice to women.

The "of" is wrong here. "As compared with" might be substituted. Or instead of using the adjective at all, the preposition "behind" might be used — "behind their Gujarati and Marathi brethren."

(62) It has put the people to a number of economic losses, *of* which they are not yet free.

We should here say "from which," but the distinction between "free from" and "free of" is sometimes rather

fine. The latter seems to imply delivery from something that once pertained, or is recognised as normally pertaining to the subject; while the former expresses freedom from something external.

(63) Owing to the lessening demand *of* Lancashire fabrics in the East.

The "of" should be "for."

(64) His disappointment *of* the results of university education.

We say "disappointment *at*." But we may speak of a man being disappointed of his expectation.

(65) To enquire *of* their truth.

(66) An enquiry *of* conditions of labour.

the "of" should be "into." "Of" is used after "enquire." in relation to the *person* of whom the enquiry is made.

(67) The rulers' aggression *of* the ruled.

The "of" should be "on" or "upon."

(68) The State could not provide the machinery *of* administering the little affairs of the villages.

The "of" should be "for."

(69) Chronic diseases crave heroic remedies, and there is no use *of* peddling with them.

The *of* should be *in*.

(70) The trouble taken in coming to Surat will be *of* some purpose.

Trouble taken is always *of* some purpose — otherwise it would not be taken; but what is meant here is "*to* some purpose," that is to some effect or result. "Of purpose" refers to the intention in the mind of the doer.

(71) Sympathisers *of* widow re-marriage.

The "of" should be "*with*," the prefix *sym* or *sun* meaning "with."

(72) Their outlook *of* national life is extremely narrow, restricted, and one-sided.

The *of* should be *on,* if, as appears, by "outlook" is meant the act of looking out. But if by "outlook" were meant the scene, or prospect in sight, the sentence would be correct.

"ON."

(73) The Guru shot an arrow at the torch, which fell *on* the ground.

The ordinary expression is "fell *to* the ground."

(74) Barbarike *on* the mouth of the Indus.

We speak of a town being *on* a river, but *at* the mouth of a river.

(75) He had been living *on* the sea-side.

This should be "*at* the sea-side."

(76) He shaved his royal master as he lay *on* bed.

We say "in bed." But if the possessive pronoun is used it is optional to say "in his bed," or "on his bed."

(77) Come let us climb *on* this tree.

We might speak of a climbing plant as climbing *on* a tree; but of a person we should say *up,* or use the verb "climb" transitively without any preposition. The "on" is a translation of the Indian *par* or *var* as used after such a verb as *chadne.*

(78) The Ministerialists are silent *on* any reform of the upper house.

We might say "silent *on*" before a general term like question" or "subject"; but in relation to a specific matter as in the text, we should say "as to" instead of "on."

(79) He was extremely sensitive *on* such things.

The "on" should be "to" or "as to"; but it would be right to say "sensitive on such points."

(80) This is a matter which reform associations should take *on* hand at once.

The native idiom is to "take *in* hand." But "on hand" is a common expression in the sense of ready or available.

(81) There is no reason to have any doubts *on* the success of this experiment.

We speak of doubts *on* a subject, but doubts *as to* an event.

"OVER."

(82) The meeting lasted *over* a couple of hours.

There is not much to take exception to here; still I do not think a native would say "over a couple of hours." "Over" when used in this sense requires to be followed by a definite quantity which fixes the limit said to be exceeded. Now "a couple of hours" is a rather elastic expression; it is not the same as "two hours," which is definite. It would be right to say the meeting "lasted over two hours," or that it "lasted a couple of hours."

(83) Please get *over* my back.

The "over" should be "on." In this connection "over" would mean on and off again on the other side.

(84) To weigh heavily *over* those educated men.

The "over" should be *on*.

(85) Mr. Jafar carries a head *over* his shoulders.

The *over* should be *on*. A native would hardly use "carry" in this connection. The ordinary expression is "to *have* a head on one's shoulders."

"ROUND."

(86) The associations should work all *round* the year.

Here "round" is a *preposition*, just as in the expressions "round the house," or "round the town," which mean encircling the house or town. In this sense "round the

year" is meaningless. What is meant is no doubt "all the year round," where "round" is an *adverb*, and strengthens the expression "all the year" by adding the sense that the revolution is to be quite complete, the starting point coming *round* again.

"SINCE."

(87) Ravi Varma then saw for the first time genuine oil paintings. *Since then he had been* a frequent and successful exhibitor at the annual exhibitions.

"Since," whether as preposition or adverb, covers all the period from the event or time named up to the time of speaking; but the following pluperfect "had been" cuts off a part of this period. We should say, "From that time he was etc.," or "After that he was etc."

(88) Bengal has been anything but happy *after* the partition.

Here, on the contrary, the perfect tense being used, and the feeling spoken of being contemplated as having continued up to the time of writing, "since" would have been better than "after."

(89) *Since* her husband's death, the late Mrs. Madhavdas *had devoted* herself to the amelioration of the condition of Hindu widows.

"Since her husband's death" would be quite correct if the conduct predicated had continued up to the time of writing; but the expression "the late," as well as the pluperfect "had devoted," shows that this was not so. Had the preterite tense been used, "*after* her husband's death" would have been right. With the pluperfect, "from" or "from the date of" is required.

(90) The boy is so sick that he hardly takes anything *since last three days*.

The preposition "since" never refers to a *period*, but always

to a *point* of time. "Since Monday" would be right, or "since the 10th of the month"; but not "since a week," or "since a year." We may indeed say "since last year," but that means since the end of last year, or since the last occurrence of the event in question in that year. In the text above the duration of time would be expressed by the phrase "*the* last three days" without any preposition. Other examples follow:—

(91) *Since a very long time* he has been searching (for) Krishna.

(92) *Since nearly twenty-five years* the Prarthana Samaj has been helping the submerged section of our society.

(93) The principle of liberty and equality is a sun that is illuminating man's path in life *since* recently.

"That has been recently illuminating etc." would do. Or "for some time past" might be substituted.

"To."

(94) A portion of the jurisdiction was transferred *to* there.

The "to" should be omitted. "There" by itself means "*to* that place."

(95) To prepare themselves *to* higher, nobler, and purer ends.

(96) The best medium *to* the propagation of truth.

(97) The ends *to* which universities exist.

In the last three examples the "to" should be "for."

(98) What I desire to press *to* your notice.

The "to" should be "upon." After such a verb as to "bring" it would be right to use "to."

(99) The company sat down to a game of naktipki (the only game of cards I am well up *to*).

The colloquial idiom is "well up *in*." "Up to" as a

colloquialism does not mean versed in, or accomplished at, but engaged in, or about to do.

(100) Exchange falls for a few weeks, *to* the utmost for a few months.

The "to" should be "at," because a particular point or limit of time is fixed. Observe the adverbial expression "to the utmost" has nothing to do with the verb—if it had it might be correct—but is confined to the expression of time.

(101) To make one pay the penalty for a sin *to* which he is not responsible.

We speak of responsibility *to* a person, but *for* a thing.

(102) Her acceptance *to* this proposal.

The "to" should be "of."

(103) The sermon was apropos *to* the occasion.

The idiom is "apropos *of*," because "apropos" means purpose.

(104) The entertaining force played *to* their special delectation.

We may speak of playing *to* an audience, but "for" is required before "delectation."

(105) Heaven's curse upon India for the treatment which the Brahman has always taught the Hindu to bestow formerly *to* the Sudra, now *to* the outcast.

To "bestow" takes "on" or "upon" before the recipient.

(106) *To* the evil that people did him he uniformly returned good.

The good was returned *to* the people who did the evil, but it was *for* the evil.

(107) English education is good for all of us, especially so *to* our women.

The "to" should be "for." The "so" is redundant.

(108) We sacrifice to reverence for the past what is claimed by justice *to* the present.

We should say "*for* the present."

(109) In view *to* the state of public feeling in Bengal some other place than Calcutta should have been selected.

"In view *to*" is said of some object to be obtained in the future. Here "in view *of*" is meant, the existing state of feeling being referred to.

(110) Out of tune *to* the avowed object of writing.

The *to* should be *with*.

(111) The woman movement is a tide that there is no setting back *to*.

The preposition here is out of place—a tide may be set back; to "set back *to* it" has no meaning.

"UP."

(112) A long piece of cloth tied round his under waist, covering *up* to his ankles.

"Under-waist" is not intelligible. "Covering" requires an object. And we should say "*down* to his ankles." Perhaps the writer had in mind the adverb "up," which is so often used after to "cover."

"UPON."

(113) When Mutsuhito *came upon* the throne.

The English idiom is "Came *to* the throne." To "come upon" has different meanings, as "he came upon a horse," *i.e.*, on horseback; or "he came upon hidden treasure,"

i.e., he fell in with, or discovered, hidden treasure. In the former "upon" is used purely as a preposition governing "horseback"; in the latter it combines with the verb much as adverbs do, as noticed in Chapter III.

(114) It is no use blaming the people *with* cowardice.

This should be "*for* cowardice." "Charging *with* cowardice" would be right.

"WITH."

(115) When *with* fair or foul means the money is got.

The "with" should be "by."

"WITHIN."

(116) All parcels should be sent prepaid and *within* the 1st December.

"Within" expresses inclosure on all sides, or, as regards time, limitation at both ends, as "within a week." In the passage above "before" is the proper preposition to use.

CHAPTER V.

CONJUNCTIONS.

"As."

(1) There is no country which has had a longer record behind it *as* our mother land.

The conjunction required after a comparative is not "as," but "than." "As" implies equality, not difference. "No country has had *as long* a record *as* ours" would be right—a denial of equality.

(2) It would have been difficult for anyone to compress more interesting information in a smaller compass *as* Sir James Thomson managed to convey in his recent lecture.

Here also the "as" should be "than." [The comparison of quantity is confused by the comparison of compass being mixed with it.] So also in the next:—

(3) Nothing is more deplorable *as* the inconsistency of this kind.

(4) The Americans keep up the price of everything so high *as* no other nation on earth can approach it.

The proper conjunction to follow the adverb "so," when used in this sense, is "that."

"BEFORE" AND "UNTIL."

(5) The collection cannot be made *before* the Puja holidays are over.

For "before" here we should say "until," the predication being not that of the two events the one must occur before the other, but that *up to the time* when the one will occur the other cannot take place.

"BUT" AND "AND."

(6) It is urged that the Kumbakonam Swami, *but* not the Sringari Swami, is the appellate authority.

"And" is wanted here and not "but." The rule seems to be that of the two things predicated and denied if one excludes the other the conjunction should be "and," but if either or both might in the nature of things have been predicated (though one is in fact not predicated but denied) then the conjunction should be "but." Thus "He went to school *but* not to college" (where he might have been to both in succession); "He was born in India and not in England" (where the one excludes the other).

"IF."

(7) Opinions may differ on the point, *if* that is the goal to keep in view, and *if* it would be practicable to reach it.

"If" is sometimes used in this sense, but it is more usual, especially in prose, to say "whether" in such cases. "If" ordinarily introduces one supposition; "whether" introduces two alternatives.

(8) Hirji suggested *if* the dal could not be made consistent enough to be taken up with a piece of chapati.

This would be right if such a word as "enquired" were substituted for "suggested." For to "enquire" raises a question, and may be followed by "if"; but to "suggest" makes a concrete proposal that a particular course should be adopted, and should be followed by "that."

(9) We are not quite sure *if* Mr. Anderson's scheme of recruiting the service will be more popular than the present system.

Here also the conjunction should be "that," as to be "sure" does not raise a contingency.

(10) *If* Sirajuddaulah had tyrannised over his Indian subjects ever so much, Lord Clive would not have joined in the conspiracy to depose him.

There is a certain ambiguity in this use of "if," and it would have been better to write "though."

"LIKE."

(11) That so conservative a sovereign *like* the Maharaja of Jaipur should have gone to England.

The adverb "so" used in this way with an adjective requires to be followed by the conjunction "as" if (as here) a comparison of two things is made. The same adverb, so used, is followed by the conjunction "that" if a result of the degree indicated by "so" has to be expressed. For example, "So conservative that he would not go to England." "Like" is no longer used as a conjunction at all.

"NEITHER . . . NOR."

(12) He was neither a bigot, nor did he allow himself to be led away by his priests.

When the pair of conjunctions "neither" and "nor" (the latter is only a contraction of the former) are used thus in correlation to one another they must be treated alike. If one of them introduces a verb, then the other must also introduce a verb: for example, "He neither hopes nor fears." But if a verb introduces one, it must also introduce the other: for example, "It is neither good nor fair." Now in the text above the verb "was" introduces "neither," and then "nor" is made to introduce another verb "did allow." This is wrong—it constitutes the absurd form "nor was he did he etc." The text might be corrected by putting the "neither" before the verb—"Neither was he a bigot nor did he allow etc.," when each conjunction introduces a verb.

"NO SOONER."

(13) Why are our girls mature no sooner than they enter their teens?

"No sooner" would require to be followed by "than," and cannot well be used in an interrogative sentence. "As soon as" should be substituted in the text.

"THAN."

(14) Our women at the present form a barrier in the way of than a help towards, movements calculated to advance the country.

The conjunction "than" should be preceded by a comparative, or a word expressive of diversity like "other." In the text "rather" should be inserted either just after "form" or just before "than."

(15) We are far ahead in the latter respect *than* Russia and China.

For "than" we should have "of." "Than" is never a preposition. "We are further ahead than etc." would be right, "than" being there a conjunction, with the effect of repeating the verb "are" of the first clause.

(16) It is with sentiments freer and higher *than with* the mere feeling of loyalty that the subjects of the Baroda State have celebrated the silver jubilee.

The second "with" is out of place. "Than" is a conjunction, and its force after a comparative is to supply a verb (if none be expressed) for the noun it introduces. The full structure here is "sentiments freer and higher than the mere feeling of loyalty (*is*)."

"THAT."

(17) A panic *that* changes will do harm.

We say "a fear that etc.," but "a panic *lest* etc." With the former there is perhaps more stress on the objective consequence, with the latter on the subjective feeling.

"WHEN."

(18) Jiva sent notice to the accused threatening to expose him, *when* the attachment on the goods was removed.

This sentence is ambiguous, as the relative conjunction "when" may mean either "as soon as" or "at which time." The latter being the meaning intended, it would have been better to say "upon which" or "and then" instead of "when."

"WHERE."

(19) I would like to ask him *where* came all the honour which he is so proud of.

"Where," by itself means "at what place," or "to what place"; but here the sense is "from what place." Either "from" should be inserted, or "whence" substituted.

(20) The utmost caution should be exercised *whether*, and how far, there should be interference.

"WHETHER."

"Caution" (whether verb or noun) is never followed directly by the conjunction "whether." For "caution" introduces only what is to be avoided, while "whether" offers an alternative. The insertion of such words as "in determining" or "as to" before "whether" would make the sentence correct.

(21) We are not sure *whether* popular party will not prefer the present automatic selection instead of some other system.

The appropriate conjunction after "sure" is ordinarily "that." If "whether" be used, two alternatives must be fairly expressed by the use of a following "or." The use of "instead of," as in the text, does not put the two alternatives upon an equality.

(22) One is led to suspect *whether* there is a soul of goodness at all, etc.

To "suspect," when used intransitively, requires to be fol-

lowed by "that," not "whether," because (unlike to "doubt") it does not refer to two alternatives, but only to the one thing suspected.

(23) Whether the universities content themselves with disseminating established knowledge, or *they* are more ambitious.

Either the "they" should be omitted, or "whether" should be repeated before it. In using the correlatives, "whether" and "or," it should be remembered that the subject or predicate introduced by the first is understood (if not expressed) after the second, and no pronoun is required after the "or" to represent an antecedent subject. For example, in "whether the man comes or goes," the subject is understood before "goes"; in "whether the man comes or the boy," the predicate is understood after "the boy."

(24) The question is whether the money-lender will give up his business, or *he* will patiently ruminate his misfortunes.

Here, also, the pronoun should be omitted, or else introduced by a repetition of "whether." [The use of "ruminate" as a transitive verb is now unusual.]

CHAPTER VI.

NOUNS.

No grammatical mistakes are made by Indian writers in the use of nouns in English, except in respect of number. Rarely is a noun which ought to be in the plural expressed in the singular, as in the following examples:

(1) He ordered the teacher to take back the slate and hand it to the boy, or "to take the *consequence.*"

The idiom is to say "consequences" in this connection.

(2) If the trouble be about the *finance,* we may assure the mission that it can be got over.

The singular "finance" is used rather of the science or system of monetary business, while concrete money matters are spoken of as "finances."

But it is a comparatively common mistake to put into the plural nouns which, according to native usage, have no plural in the particular sense in question. The same nouns in very many cases have plurals when used in a different sense. Hence the mistake on the part of a foreigner is very natural. Many of the following instances will be seen to be of this character.

(3) A rich Zamindar had two wives, from one of whom he had *issues.*

(4) Until re-marriage was legalised, and its *issues* declared legitimate.

(5) By marrying another wife and having more *issues* by her.

"Issue," in the sense of progeny, has no plural form, though in other senses it has.

(6) She gave them her last *advices.*

Advice " in the sense of *counsel* has no plural form, though in the sense of *information* it has.

(7) All sorts of games and such things are to them now forbidden *fruits.*

The expression, "forbidden fruit," bears a traditional reference, and as such is not used in the plural.

(8) His suggestions about the Swadeshi movement were really full of *meanings.*

(9) Revolutions were adopted to check *extravagances* on marriages.

(10) All selfless and kind people of every country have always acted in similar *strains.*

(11) The facts are delicious enough without *comments.*

A native would use the singular in all these cases. So also in the next three instances :—

(12) The song called forth loud *applauses.*

(13) A loud yell of *execrations* was set up.

(14) The country is not prepared to take him at his *words.*

(15) That they should have come forth from their *seclusions* and recorded their sense of sorrow.

"Seclusion" is never used in the plural, except in its rare sense of "a secluded place."

(16) There is a limit to such flippant *banters.*

"Banter," I think, has no plural.

(17) In Germany the State finances the universities, and prescribes in a general way the subjects of *instructions.*

Instruction in the abstract is meant, and so the singular should have been used. The use of the plural is confined to concrete directions or orders.

(18) People of Bengal are now being led by persons with apparently very blurred and impracticable *visions.*

Presumably *vision* in the sense of power of sight is meant, not *visions* in the sense of apparitions.

(19) Redeem it from the oft-repeated but ill-merited *odiums*.

The noun "odium" is not used in the plural.

(20) A bag of *silvers*.

Nor is silver.

(21) The chief feature of the conference was the keen and watchful *interests* of the public in its proceedings.

The distinction between the *interest* which is never used in the plural and that which may be so used is rather fine. Interest in the sense of appreciative regard has no plural; but interest in the sense of personal advantage or disadvantage has. Or we may say that a subjective interest is always spoken of in the singular, while objective interests may be plural.

(22) Prizes were awarded for articles of exceptional *merits*.

This is not positively wrong, but, unless there was special occasion to contemplate merits of different kinds, a native would write *merit*.

(23) The foreign elements are easily assimilated, and made *parts* and *parcels* of our beings.

The expression "part and parcel" is never used in the plural: it is too individual to bear both its members receiving the plural affix, and yet not sufficiently like a single word to permit of the affix at the end only.

(24) They clothed their sermons in *garbs* suited to the taste etc.

"Garb" may possibly sometimes bear the plural form, but here the sense is too abstract to permit it.

(25) Calculated only to add fresh *fuels* to the fire of popular ill-feeling.

"Fuel" is, I think, never used in the plural.

(26) Are they not the *off-springs* of the immigrants from India?

(27) I conceive that chiefly the existing form of matrimony, and partly some political causes, account for the increasing *numbers* of female *off-springs* over males.

" Offspring " is not used in the plural. " Numbers " would be better in the singular as only one general number is here in contemplation. But " offspring " having no plural, we should not speak of a *number* of offspring. " Births " would do, or " children born."

(28) Receptacles are put up for the deposit of fruit *peels.*

We may speak of the " peels " of different kinds of fruit, but when there is no individuality in question we should use the word in the singular.

(29) They will ignore both the protestations and the *bombasts.*

" Bombast " is not used in the plural.

(30) We have to work against great odds, which are represented by our old traditions, our poverty of *resources,* and the hostile competition of advanced races.

This word when used in the plural always means some concrete source of aid, such as pecuniary means. In the sense of mental capacity to find expedients it is used only in the singular. That the writer meant to use the word in the latter sense is shown by his reference to the " undeveloped but unlimited resources " of India in the next sentence. In fact, he complains of poverty of *resource* in the presence of unlimited *resources.*

(31) Before finding *faults* with the preachers.

In the established phrase " to find fault with " the noun is used in the abstract and therefore in the singular. If certain specific faults are to be mentioned then the plural might be used, but then the following preposition would be " in " and not " with."

(32) The Nagar Grihasths have taken a step in advance as far as the question of foreign *travels* is concerned

We may speak of the *travels* of a particular person; but in the text travel in the abstract is meant.

(33) Students should, therefore, if *needs* be, be taught politics as a science.

"Need," in this connection, should be used in the singular as an abstract noun. Perhaps the writer had in mind the expression "needs must"; but "needs" is there an adverb, meaning necessarily, and not a noun.

(34) Are cases ever won by *counsels* who insult judges?

In this sense the plural form of "counsel" is the same as the singular.

(35) Cobwebs and *soots*.

"Soot" has no plural. If not the substance soot itself, but particles of it, or marks made by it, be intended, the term "smut" may be used in the plural.

(36) The tree is not always to be judged by its *fruits*. It takes time for the *fruits* to appear.

The plural form "fruits" is seldom used except in such comprehensive expressions as "the fruits of the earth."

(37) Barbarike exported silk *threads*, etc.; Saurashtra exported *grains* and cotton.

Individual threads are not here in contemplation, nor individual grains.

(38) To send students to foreign countries for *studies*.

"Study" in the abstract is meant.

(39) Thus many a widow dies social *martyrs*.

The phrase "many a" though plural in effect is singular in form, so instead of "martyrs" we should have "a martyr."

(40) The avarice of *these* handful of speculators is greatly whetted.

So also here, though the phrase is plural in effect, the pronoun should be singular to agree with "handful."

(41) This mock revel that will cost you not *a pence.*

"Pence" is plural, and we cannot say "a pence." Observe the word "penny" has two plurals: pennies, which means a number of individual penny coins, and "pence," which means an amount of pennies in value. Thus "eighteen pennies" means eighteen of the bronze coins called pennies; eighteen pence means a sum of one shilling and a half.

(42) Buddhism began to achieve *victories* after *victories* over its great rivals.

The use of the singular sufficiently expresses the succession of events, and the use of the plural has the effect of putting the events into groups, which is meaningless.

CHAPTER VII.

PRONOUNS.

SECTION I.—POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS.

INDIAN writers frequently make errors in the use of the possessive pronouns "his," "her," "its," etc., by taking them to be as extensive in meaning as the corresponding "of him," "of her," etc. The latter forms, however, express a much wider relation of appurtenance between two things, while the former are restricted to a relationship of possession or something analogous to it. The misunderstanding no doubt arises from the fact that the Indian languages do not possess the alternative forms, but one form only both for "his" and "of him," such as *uska, tyacha, teno,* etc. Thus an Indian writer, after referring to the limitations of Indian vernacular literature, puts the question:

> (1) How much of a man's liberal education can be got through *its* medium?

The medium is in no sense the possession of the literature, and we require to say "the medium *of it.*" So again in the following sentence "their comparison" is wrong, because the comparison is in no sense theirs—they do not make it; it is made about them. The phrase should be "comparison of them."

> (2) The want of education in Indian women makes *their* comparison with European women most unfavourable.

Similarly in the next "their benefit" should be "the benefit of them," because the benefit does not belong to the medical charities, but arises out of them.

> (3) Medical charities are for the poor; but it appears that the most impoverished never get *their* benefit.

But Indian writers sometimes go further and use the possessive pronoun not instead of "of" but instead of some other preposition. Thus we have—

(4) Herein lies his difference from many other prominent men

where "his difference" stands, not for "the difference of him," but for "the difference *between* him etc." Again,

(5) Whatever of good there was in Brahmanism it kept unto itself without admitting the country to *its* participation.

Here "its participation" stands for "participation *in* it." And again:

(6) I started a widows' home and a girls' school in *its* connection.

where "its connection" stands for "connection *with* it."

(7) The facts are plain: their explanation is not easy.

This is similar to examples (2) and (3) above.

(8) The nach-girls are depraved, one and all, and *their* very sight, no less than their songs and gestures, should be a terror to respectable people.

"*Their* very sight" suggests their power of vision. It should be "the very sight *of them*."

(9) They may visit Indian clubs and become *their* members.

"Their members" would include all the members of the clubs. To get the partitive effect it is necessary to say "members of them."

(10) It was decided to form a central association, and to create its provincial branches in important centres throughout India.

This at once strikes the native ear as wrong, but it is not altogether easy to say why. It would not be wrong to say "form a central association and let its branches spread all over India." The branches would then seem to come naturally from the original stock. But in the text the writer speaks of *creating* branches, and at the same time

refers to them as *belonging* (its) to a stock which does not yet exist.

The possessive pronoun is occasionally used by Indian writers where the definite article is required, as in the following :—

(11) *Their* full stature of their manhood.

The personality is expressed by the second " their," and the first should be " the."

(12) There is one specialist to whom even Principal Selby must extend *his* hand of fellowship.

We should say " *the* hand of fellowship," the words suggesting rather the abstract disposition to be friendly than the rendering of assistance on a particular occasion. Contrast "*a* helping hand " in example (10) on page 36.

Again, the possessive pronoun is occasionally omitted where its presence is necessary, as below :—

(13) My countrymen have adopted the beautiful song of Bande Mataram as national hymn.

Either the pronoun " their " or one or other of the articles is required before " national."

(14) The opening of eyes in this respect, I regard as a great moral gain.

Some pronoun (" our," " their," or as the case may be) is required before " eyes."

(15) A father within teens.

We should say " in *his* teens " or " in *the* teens."

(16) He impressed upon the Muhammadans the necessity of regarding India as mother-land.

Either the pronoun " their " or the article " the " is required before motherland.

(17) For the protection of official secrets, *whose* untimely divulgation might endanger the public interest.

The use of "whose" in relation to inanimate things, that is, as the equivalent of "of which," is getting more and more uncommon. [As to "interest," see page 87.]

(18) A line of action *whose* wisdom is yet to be proved.

"The wisdom of which" is the usual form.

SECTION II.—OTHER PRONOUNS.

There is a class of cases in which the demonstrative pronoun (used absolutely, not attributively) is frequently omitted by Indian writers, though its presence is required according to the English idiom. The occasion of the error is that the genitive form of a noun can always be used as an adjective in the Indian languages, but that is not so in English. In the following four examples the demonstrative pronoun "that" (used absolutely) is required before "of Partab Singh," "of the Sarkar," "of his coadjutor," "of the Hindus":

(1) The earliest name found in the history of Buland-shahar is of Partab Singh.

(2) The work was to be considered as mine, and not of the Sarkar.

(3) It was due to his wisdom and, no doubt, also of his renowned coadjutor.

(4) India is their mother-land just as much as it is of the Hindus.

(5) Our public men have been asking for protection of our own industries, and not of the United Kingdom.

Similarly here "of those" is required before "of the United Kingdom." And in the next "those" is required after "than":

(6) The causes of the ferment are other than the executive have fastened upon.

(7) The *Panjabi* writes like a schoolboy, and *that* of not a very brilliant order.

Here "that" refers not to the act of writing but to the schoolboy, and the proper word would be "one."

(8) Whenever an Indian attempts to bestow any care on his children, he insists on *them* working incessantly at their lessons.

This form of expression may be found in English writers, but the better form is to use the possessive "their" instead of "them"; for it is the working and not the person that is insisted on.

(9) Whose sprightly madness cheats *his self*.

"His self," though correct upon the analogy of "myself, etc," is a term used only by quite uneducated persons, and is not recognised in literature.

(10) The so-called new school has scarcely anything to distinguish *itself* except scurrility in the press and factiousness in meetings.

"Itself" is here a mistake for "it." To "distinguish oneself" means to acquire distinction or eminence, and the phrase taken as a whole (though it may be resolved into a verb and its object) is used intransitively, and would require some such preposition as "by" before the word expressing the means of acquiring distinction. But the writer means that the school has no mark by which *other persons* will distinguish *it* from other schools.

(11) It may be said that executive officials have little freedom of action left to *themselves*.

This should be "to *them*"; for it is not the officials themselves who leave the liberty to themselves, but higher authorities who leave it to them.

(12) And then with knowledge all the barriers crossed,
He enters Me and in Myself is lost.

This is a misuse of the reflexive pronoun "myself," which can only be used in relation to the first person.

(13) We have no banks of ours.

Here we should say of "our own."

(14) O, holy angel! Why not come to me—me, who *is* all anxiety to embrace thee.

A relative pronoun is of the same person as its antecedent. The verb here should therefore be "am," not "is."

(15) The moderate men of the party *which* has for its object a gradually progressive expansion of Indian liberties, and *whose* ambition is to place India on a level with the self-governing colonies.

The change from the impersonal "which" to the personal "whose" in relation to the same antecedent is not convenient though strictly correct. It would be better to say "the ambition of which."

(16) It can hardly be expected that we shall get all *what* we want.

(17) That is the least *what* Mr. Morley's writings teach us.

The simple relative "which" or "that" should take the place of "what," which, as a relative, is always compound, meaning "that which."

(18) The more reckless write whatever nonsense *that* comes uppermost.

The "that" should be omitted, it being included in the preceding "whatever."

(19) We do not know *which* "good people" *New India* is referring to.

Instead of "which" we should have "what," as no particular classes of good people had previously been

specified. Of things in contemplation we should say: Which of these do you want? But of things not present to the mind: What do you want?

(20) *Which* Hindu father would dare give his consent in the face of the social slavery in which he is born?

This is similar. The question is not *which* Hindu father out of two or three specified ones, but *what* one of the whole indefinite number would dare etc.

(21) That an Indian woman does not receive *that* sort of education *as* may make her fit to

The correlation should be "that . . . which," or else "such . . . as."

(22) Even for *such* Hindus *who* can claim only a surface acquaintance with their religion.

The correlation should be "such . . . *as*," or else "those . . . who."

(23) Our students receive their education either in Government schools and colleges, or in *such* institutions *which* are directly or indirectly under Government control.

Here also we should have either "such . . . as" or "those . . . which."

CHAPTER VIII.

ADJECTIVES.

"AKIN."

(1) Polygamy is also an *akin* subject.

The adjective "akin" when used attributively is followed by the preposition "to." "Polygamy is a subject akin to this" would be right. Or using the adjective predicatively we might say, "The two subjects are akin." In the text the adjective "kindred" might be substituted.

"BOTH."

(2) She took it up with *her both* hands.

The order should be "with both her hands." The treatment of the adjective "both" is thus exceptional, as we should say "with her two hands," "with his ten sons," etc.

(3) Its physique depends upon that of *its both* the parents.

The order should be "of both its parents," or "of both the parents"—either the article or the pronoun being omitted.

"ANY" AND "SOME."

As the Indian vernaculars have usually but one equivalent for these two adjectives, there is naturally some confusion in their use by Indians. The distinction between them is not altogether easy to explain, and there are occasions when either may be used indiscriminately. Each is used to express a part of a whole, and with each the particular part is indefinite; but while with "any" the part is always absolutely indefinite, with "some" the part, though unknown, may be fixed as to its identity. Thus to the question, "Is there any

news?" the answer, if in the affirmative, must be "There is "*some* news," because the news, though not yet declared, is fixed as to its identity. But the negative answer would be, "There is not *any* news," because the speaker extends his answer to all possible news whatever. So to the question "Have you any money?" the answer must be either "Yes, I have *some* money," or "No, I have not *any* money." To answer "Yes, I have *any* money," would mean, if it meant anything, that whatever money was in the world, the speaker had it. And to answer, "No, I have not *some* money," would be equally meaningless, because while the speaker had not *some money*, he might have *some other money;* and one amount would be as good as another as the basis of an affirmative reply. The above questions might, indeed, be put in either form: Is there *any* news? or Is there *some* news? Have you *any* money? or Have you *some* money? the only difference being that in the one case the speaker frames his question according to his own want of information (any); and in the other he frames it with reference to the particular information (some) which the person questioned may be able to supply. But in either case the answer must be "Yes, some," or "Not any."

The general rule is that "any" applies to every part of the whole that is in contemplation; "some" applies to a particular, though it may be an indefinite and unknown part. Consequently, "any" is chiefly used in interrogative and negative sentences; for a question or a denial, to be effective, must apply to every part. But an assertion is usually as to a particular part, and then "some" is used.

These remarks as to the adjectives "any" and "some" apply also to the same words used as pronouns, and to the nouns "anybody," and "somebody," the adverbs "any-

how" and "somehow," and the like. In the following five examples the "some" should be "any."

(4) There was no case of *some* importance in which Mr. Badruddin had not to appear.

(5) Unhappily they are not nurtured according to *some* sound method.

(6) The ordinary text books deal with the history of some particular part of the world, without explaining its bearing upon *some* general movement of civilisation.

(7) Schools should be established in nearly every town of *some* importance.

(8) One must go to Britain if one wishes to study the British woman to *some* advantage.

In the following example "any" should be "some."

(9) They must make it a point to meet together, and above all mess together. Unless they do *any* such thing, no good step can be made in our march of progress.

"GLAD."

(10) We are extremely *glad* with the sympathetic speech of his Excellency.

"Glad" is an adjective of rather peculiar use, and is seldom used attributively. Thus we should not say "a glad man," though we may say a happy man, a joyful man, a merry man. "Glad" is usually followed by "of" or "at," or an infinitive, or a clause introduced by "that"—glad *of* an opportunity, glad *at* the news, glad *to hear*, glad *that it is so*.

"LIFELONG."

(11) A Maratha widow is to be placed at the head of the educational branch of the institution. She has promised to live *life-long* there.

(12) The pain is left to us to be endured *life-long*.

"Lifelong" is an adjective, and cannot be used as an adverb as in the examples above. "Long" by itself is an

adverb as well as an adjective, and it would be possible to say "her whole life long," using "life" and "long" as two separate words.

"MORE."

(13) The thicker the layer of ignorance the *more* the necessity of the quickening influence.

We should rather say "the greater" than "the more" here. Compare the use of the adverbs "more" and "better" in examples (19) and (20), page 52.

"NEXT."

(14) "Should we leave the bungalow? We are prepared to do so early *next* morning."

In speaking in the present of the coming day, we always say "to-morrow" instead of "next." In speaking in the past, "next" is right. For example, "I leave to-morrow morning," "I left the next morning."

"OFTEN."

(15) In *oftener* cases than not it happens that . . .

Here "often" is used as an adjective, but such use is very rare; and "oftener cases" sounds very strange. "More" would ordinarily be used.

"ONE."

(16) During the past *one* year fifteen banks have been established.

(17) Within the last *one* year a new party has arisen.

(18) For the last *one* century.

A native would omit the adjective "one" in all these cases.

"SINGLE."

(19) Not a *single* of the principles here laid down is obligatory of belief.

"Single" is used as a noun only in certain games and a few

technical senses. Here it should be treated as an adjective and followed by "one." So also in the following:—

(20) No Parsi has ever trained up a *single* of his female relatives as an actress.

"STILL-BORN."

(21) The younger wife of the Rai Sahib gave birth to a *still-born.*

"Still-born" is an adjective, and cannot be used as a noun, The word "child" should be added.

"SUCH."

(22) It is a mistake to petition Government even in regard to *such* matters in which it alone can grant redress.

"Such" is out of place here, and should be omitted, or else the relative pronoun "as" should be substituted for "in which." "Such" always implies a comparison of two things, though one of the two may not be expressly mentioned. Here only one class of matters is in contemplation.

(23) Many of our crying needs, *such,* for example, the sanitary improvement of India.

Here either the "such" should be omitted, or it should be followed by "as" before "the sanitary improvement."

"UNVERSED."

(24) Many of them were unlearned and *unversed.*

The adjective "unversed" is only used with the preposition "in" following it and introducing mention of the subject in which the want of skill or practice is found.

"VERY."

(25) Mr. Viresalimgam was escorted home in a grand procession with fire-works. That *very* night he left for Madras.

The adjective "very" carries with it an intensive sense,

which is out of place here. Had there been anything very remarkable or startling in the departure following so soon on the return home, the adjective would have been appropriate. Thus one might say, "I saw him in perfect health at eight o'clock, and that very night he was dead." But in the text "the same night" would be sufficient.

(26) The lanes were so dark that he could hardly read their *very* names.

Here also the intensive power of "very" is out of place. All that is meant is "he could hardly even read their names." If one were speaking, say of some perished dynasty, it might be appropriate to say "its very name is forgotten."

(27) Refusing to tolerate their *very* presence.

This is similar. The writer means "their *mere* presence," or "*even* their presence."

(28) The *whole* London.

The adjective "whole" is not used with proper names—we should say, "the whole *of* London," where whole is a noun.

CHAPTER IX.

VERBS.

ERRORS in the use of verbs fall under four principal classes, which are illustrated in the following four sections of this chapter:—

1. Misuse of the Auxiliary verbs;
2. Misuse of Transitive verbs as Intransitive and *vice versâ;*
3. Misuse of Tenses;
4. Misuse of the Gerund for the Infinitive and *vice versâ.*

SECTION I.—AUXILIARY VERBS.

"SHALL" AND "WILL."

Mistakes in the use of these two words are very common, and yet may be very easily avoided. In the following fourteen examples "shall" is a mistake for "will," and in the eleven which follow after, "will" is a mistake for "shall":

(1) Their conviction that war *shall* ever continue to be a necessary evil.

(2) He *shall* have formed a wrong estimate if he supposes . . .

(3) The only question is whether he *shall* face it like a man.

(4) The abolition of the declaration in question *shall* obviate this difficulty.

(5) This is a new departure, and a ladies' gallery *shall* now form a part of the conference gathering in all future years.

(6) That the legislative councils need expansion is an admitted fact, and we hope the congress *shall* have not to wait long for a move in this direction.

(7) The Sadharan Brahma Samaj *shall* never forget its first president.

(8) To do so, however, they *shall* have to rise superior to petty considerations of self.

(9) You have long talked of it you say, but when *shall* the time come for you to work it out?

(10) Unable to pay the oppressive tax, the people *shall* fly from village and town.

(11) One might hope that the time is not far distant when it *shall* recover its former state.

(12) An example such as *shall* certainly not be surpassed.

(13) He does not assume that the nations of the East *shall* all rise or fall together.

(14) The perfection of the Empire may take long in coming, but come it *shall* in the fulness of its time.

(15) The more we correct our defects and increase our worth, the more we *will* advance our cause.

(16) If we persevere in the direction of Svadeshism, we *will* be able within a measurable distance of time to produce in the country most of the articles we require.

(17) We *will* get all the political privileges that we want when we show our fitness for them.

(18) The moment we give it up we *will* be dead.

(19) We *will* see how the idea of a new religion led to its foundation.

(20) Bear this distinction in mind or we *will* never understand each other.

(21) Then, and only then, *will* we find results other than the bitter fruit of discontent.

(22) I crave leave to say one or two words which I hope I *will* be pardoned for saying.

(23) When I *will* not hear the wind blowing, when I *will* never see the summer flowers growing, and when I *will* never feel the winter snows.

(24) Unless we train ourselves in individual politics we *will* never build up a nation.

(25) The day we are able to revive our ancient arts and industries, we *will* be in a position not only to . . . but *will* be able to . . .

In order to avoid such errors as the above, it is only necessary to remember that the auxiliaries "shall" and "will" have each of them two distinct uses. Each may be used to express mere futurity of action, but, apart from this, "shall" may be used to convey a sense of compulsion or insistence, and "will" to express wish or determination.

Now, when employed merely to express futurity of action, the use of these two words is perfectly clear and simple. The whole rule is merely this: that "shall" pertains to the first person, and "will" to the second and third persons. So that the conjugation runs thus:—

I shall	We shall
Thou wilt	You will
He will	They will

This one rule is sufficient to correct all the mistakes shown in the twenty-five examples just given.

It follows from what is said above that when "will" is used with the first person, or "shall" with the second or third persons, something more than mere futurity of action is conveyed—in the case of "will," wish or determination, and in the case of "shall," compulsion or insistence. Thus in the English marriage service the question is asked, "Will you have this woman to be your wedded wife?" And the answer is "I will." In this connection "I shall" would be absurd, as an expression of will is distinctly asked for. As an example with the second person we have the command "Thou *shalt* not kill." Also the story of the king who, because his subject showed fear of him, beat him, exclaiming, "How dare you be afraid of me, sir! You must love me; you *shall* love me." Or again, very markedly, in Lamb's line:—

"Though thou want'st not, thou *shalt* have them."

Then, as an example with the third person, take Kirke White's lines on the death of Nelson:—

"He must not sink;
The good, the brave—he must not, *shall* not sink
Without the meed of some melodious tear."

Or the enactment of our Penal Code, that "Whoever commits murder *shall* be punished with death or transportation for life." For the law is not predicting what *will* happen, but is declaring what it insists *shall* happen.

Now it may be asked: If "shall" with the first person expresses mere futurity, how is the sense of compulsion or insistence to be conveyed with the use of the first person? And, similarly, if "will" with the second and third persons expresses mere futurity, how is the sense of wish or determination to be conveyed with the use of those persons? The answer to these questions is (1) that the intended meaning is often indicated by the context or by the circumstances of the statement made; (2) that in speaking this can be further aided by the tone of the voice; and (3) that a certain amount of ambiguity may remain. For example, if one man says to another "You shall not enter this house," and the other replies, "Yes, I *shall*," there is no doubt (even without the accent that would, in speaking, be put on the "shall") that the reply is not merely a statement of what will happen, but expresses the fact that the speaker insists upon entering. So also if one man says "Tell them not to come here," and the person spoken to replies, "But they say they *will*," not mere futurity but a determination to come is expressed. An example in the second person is supplied by the question from the marriage service cited above—"*Will* you have this woman . . .?" does not merely raise a question of futurity, but clearly invites an expression

of will. On the other hand, such a statement as "I shall go to Bombay to-morrow," without any illuminating context, and without the modification of the speaking voice, may mean either that I insist upon going, or that as a matter of fact I shall go. And similarly of "will" with the second and third persons. But these cases of possible ambiguity present no difficulty in actual practice. And if the simple rule given above be remembered (namely, that futurity of action, when no sense either of obligation on the one hand or of desire on the other is involved, is expressed by "shall" with the first person, and by "will" with the second and third persons) no mistakes in the use of these auxiliaries are likely to be made.

In the following example "shall" is used with the first person, but, as the speaker is expressly exercising a choice, "will" would be better.

(26) I may go on noticing article after article, but *shall* conclude with sugar.

But interrogative sentences form an exception to the rule that in the second person mere futurity is expressed by "will." On the contrary, "shall" is used for that purpose. Thus we say, "*Shall* you be at home to-morrow?" The explanation given by some grammarians is that "shall" or "will" is used interrogatively *according as the one or the other would be used in reply*. "Shall you be at home?" expects the answer "I shall," or "I shall not," as the case may be—a mere question of futurity. But "Will you be at home?" expects the answer "I will," or "I will not"—a matter of intention or pleasure.

It should not be overlooked in this connection that besides the auxiliary verb "will," there is a substantive verb to "will." The two are distinct and have different past tenses,

namely, "would" of the auxiliary, and "willed" of the substantive verb. Thus we say "He willed me to do it," meaning that he exercised his power of will over me to induce me to do it. The word, however, is not of very frequent use, nor does it present any special difficulty.

"SHOULD" AND "WOULD."

Just as "shall" is used with the first person, and "will" with the second and third persons when mere futurity has to be expressed, so "should" (the preterite of "shall") is used with the first person, and "would" (the preterite of "will") is used with the second and third persons. But it must be borne in mind that "would" and "should" have other uses, which will be dealt with later. Meanwhile, I give examples of the wrong use of these words merely in relation to the persons with which they are used as the past tenses of "shall" and "will." In the first two "should" is wrongly used for "would":

(27) When the Gaikwar wondered what India *should* have been if it had come in contact with the West, but not been subjugated.

(28) An agitation for which there *should* have been no occasion if Lord Curzon had not been Governor General.

And in the following eleven "would" is wrongly used for "should":

(29) Without them we *would* never be able to do any solid good.

(30) Had the council decided otherwise, conceive what we should be—I think we *would* be in blissful ignorance of our defects.

(31) Otherwise we *would* not have been enduring the present difficulties now.

(32) What we *would* call the aggressive form of politics.

(33) Were I properly to review all the great acts of this ruler of men, I *would* be filling up volumes.

(34) If the importation of all fine goods were stopped, we *would* still be none the worse for it.

(35) I have not been able to dwell on this need at as much length as I *would* have wished.

(36) We *would* be proud indeed if our school acted as a feeder to it.

(37) If we were to recall the age of Abu Bakr and Omar, we *would* find the entire machinery in the hands of these two men.

(38) I *would* be giving a one-sided account if I were to avoid referring

(39) We *would* have gained nothing by his resignation.

Though "should" and "would" are called the past tenses or preterites of "shall" and "will," it is to be observed that they have other uses also, some of which convey no sense of past time at all. So also have "could" and "might," the past tenses of "can" and "may," uses which convey no sense of past time. The following are examples :—

You should go and see him to-morrow.

Would you be able to come here on Monday?

Could you be here on Monday?

I might perhaps be able to come on Tuesday.

Again, "should" is used to convey a sense of duty or propriety which has no very obvious connection with "shall," as in such expressions as "You should do your duty," or "One man should not injure another." In the following example "should," in this sense, is required, as the writer is not speaking of any contingency but is making an independent suggestion as to what ought to be done :—

(40) Lord Cromer's name *would* be written in gold, not only in the annals of Egypt, but as one of the greatest statesmen of England.

Other examples of the wrong use of "should" follow :—

(41) If the Indian party does so, it *should* be a very simple party.

Here a native would say "must"; for the contemplated contingent act is regarded as an indication of what the character of the party must of necessity be.

(42) The British connection must endure if India *should* be able to develop herself in all directions.

This would mean that in the event of India being able etc., the connection must endure. But the writer presumably means that the connection is necessary in order that India may etc. The substitution of "is to be able" for "should be able" would suffice.

In the next example also the first "should" ought to be replaced by "is to," for the writer is not considering the contingency of the discussion being of value, but what must be done in order to make it so :—

(43) We may agree or disagree with the contentions on either side, but if the discussion *should* be of any value, we should discern the points around which it really centres.

For illustrations of the wrong use of "is to," see examples (48) and (49) forward.

"Would" also has some curious uses which seem to have no connection with "will." It sometimes expresses habit or custom, as in the lines :—

"There at the foot of yonder nodding beech,
That wreaths its old fantastic roots so high,
His listless length at noon-tide *would* he stretch,
And pore upon the brook that babbles by."

So again in this line of Keats's :—

"And constant as her vespers *would* he watch."

"Would" again is used of a contingency which has not happened, and which, in the view of the speaker, may or may not happen, as in the lines :—

"For, high-soul'd Maid, what sorrow *would* it be
That Mountain floods should thunder as before,
And Ocean bellow from his rocky shore,
And neither awful Voice be heard by thee!"

But "would" cannot be used of a contingency as to which no doubt is felt, as in the following passage :—

(44) Brother and brother may live together for years, and may yet really never know each other's heart. How much more difficult *would* it be for men of different races and opposite political prejudices to know each other.

Here instead of "would" we should have "must" or "will," according as the present or future time is in view.

(45) Mr. Birdwood did yeoman service as an interpreter between England and India, and the regret occasioned by his loss *would* be keen on both sides.

This occurs in an obituary notice, and, the loss having already occurred, the "would" is quite out of place, and should be replaced by "will" or "must."

(46) A great personality has passed away in the death of Col. Olcott. The news *would* be received with profound regret.

Here there is neither anything conditional nor anything to be spoken of in the past tense. The "would" should be "will."

(47) If Marathas were willing to inter-marry with the castes below them, why *would* they care for Vedic rites?

Here "should" is required in place of "would," because the sentence is interrogative. See the rule given in respect of "shall" and "will," on page 108.

"IS TO."

In examples (42) and (43) above "should" has been used where "is to" is required. In the next two "is to" is wrongly used for "must."

> (48) The establishment of a punitive police has become a necessity. The police must exist, and the cost *is to be* borne by Muhammadans alone.

Here the writer is describing what he thinks it is necessary to do, and he should have said "*must* be borne," not "*is to* be borne." The latter phrase would have been correct in describing what the authorities had decided to do.

> (49) If there is to be a real reform of the administration, the monopoly of the Covenanted Civil Service *is to* be broken in upon.

Here the first "is to" is correct, but the second should be "must."

"MIGHT."

The past auxiliary "might" again seems to present a good deal of difficulty to Indian writers, and it is far too frequently used by them. Especially when used in the form "might have," does its particular force seem to be missed. That force is usually expressive of an opportunity missed or of some contingency having failed to occur. This force is well illustrated in the humorous lines:—

"He might have been a Russian,
A Turk, a Greek, a Prussian,
Or else Italian;
But in spite of all temptations
To belong to other nations,
He remains an Englishman."

INDRA NARAIN S
LIBRARY
CALCUTTA.

The humour here depends upon the appreciation of the "might have been," which does not mean "it might have

happened that he was born a Russian etc.," but conveys the sense that he had his opportunity and deliberately declined it. Indeed, so strong is this sense that we sometimes speak of lost opportunities as "the might have beens"; and an American poet has written—

"Of all sad words of tongue or pen,
The saddest are these, *I might have been.*"

But we find Indian writers expressing themselves thus :—

(50) Those of you who *might have* studied the history of Greece know how they put ethics in the fore-front of all sciences.

(51) What little work we *might have* done heretofore can only make us ruefully ponder over the past.

(52) Whatever *might have* been the shortcomings of the Amirs in other respects, they have never been wanting in religious tolerance.

In this last example the use of the perfect tense "have never been" brings the review of facts up to the present time, and we should have "may have" instead of "might have." In the two previous examples, so far from "might have" referring to a lost opportunity, it is distinctly recognised that some history had been studied, that some work had been done, and in each instance the "might have" should be "may have." In these particular examples, indeed, there is another reason for requiring "may" instead of "might," and that is that the verb in the main clause of each sentence is in the present tense. But this aspect of the matter will be treated of under the head of "Tenses" (see page 134). It may, however, be well to mention here that the form "might have" does not always suggest a missed opportunity. Besides its special meaning it has also its ordinary use as the past tense of "may have"; and in the above examples, if the main clause in the sentence had been in the past tense, then "might have" would have been right

in the subsidiary clause. For example, "I knew that he might have come," "It never occurred to me that he might have been stopped on the way." But here is an example in which no such consideration is involved, the clause not being subsidiary to another :—

(53) The recovery during the year under review might have *been* due to the increasing outturn from plantations.

Here "might" is quite out of place, as the writer is speaking of what may actually have happened. Otherwise, if he had had occasion to say, "The loss might have been avoided," when, in fact, it was not avoided.

"MUST."

The auxiliary verb "must" expresses an imperative requirement either of duty or of necessity, and therefore it cannot be used to express the object of a desire or wish, or the subject of expediency, as in the six following examples :—

(54) It is desirable that action *must* immediately be taken.

Here the auxiliary required is "should," or it would suffice to say "be taken immediately."

(55) I wish rather that secondary education *must* be so devised that it can give more effective aid.

Instead of "must" we should have "may" or "should," or "be" alone.

(56) He deemed it expedient that primary education *must* be made obligatory.

Here "should" is the proper auxiliary. So also in the next three :—

(57) It is proper that every nation *must* endeavour to advance.

(58) The British representatives are anxious that the proceedings *must* be kept as private as possible.

(59) What *must* have been left to a private individual was magnified into a State prosecution.

(60) The partners in Madras must have known the fate of their remittances from India. It is difficult to say what exactly they *must* have done in the circumstances. Were they to . . .

Here, by "must have done" is evidently meant "ought to have done"; but the words will not bear that meaning. This is rather curious, because "must" in the present tense may express a strong obligation of duty. But "must have" is expressive of necessity, and not at all of duty. For example, "We must see to it," "He must have been dead."

SECTION II.—MISUSE OF TRANSITIVE VERBS AS INTRANSITIVE AND VICE VERSA.

English transitive and intransitive verbs do not exactly correspond with the *sakarmak* and *akarmak* verbs in the languages derived from Sanskrit, and hence mistakes in their use are common. Of the two forms of error by far the more frequent is that of using a transitive verb as intransitive. And this mistake is often found to consist in inserting before the object of the *verb* the preposition which would naturally follow the corresponding *noun*. Thus, instead of saying "We encountered the enemy," an Indian writer is apt to say "We encountered *with* the enemy," because "with" is the preposition which would follow the noun "encounter"—"an encounter with the enemy." So again, instead of saying "He emphasised the point," an Indian writer will sometimes say "He emphasised *on* the point," because "on" is the preposition which would follow the noun "emphasis." I proceed now to give actual specimens:

(1) Public attention *focusses* principally upon that part of the report.

The verb to "focus" cannot be used intransitively—the noun

"focus" means a hearth, a central point, and the verb means only "to bring to a point."

(2) "Of course I would," assured the begam.

"Assure" is transitive, and requires an object.

(3) No counsel, however wise, is *heeded to* when it affects the army.

To "heed" is now used only transitively; the preposition "to" should be omitted.

(4) Mr. Gokhale rightly *warned* that the advocacy of wrong methods tended to divert attention from the right methods.

(5) Sir Andrew Fraser rightly *warned* that ignorance of the people leads to misunderstanding.

To "warn" is transitive, and requires an object, such as "us" or "them." [Observe in example (4) the correct omission and use of the article: "wrong methods," because they are indefinite in number and character; "*the* right methods" because they are definite and particular. See page 12.]

(6) Government have *safeguarded against* the deterioration of their soil.

To "safeguard" is always transitive—"have safeguarded themselves from" would do, if that be the meaning intended, or "provided against" if it be meant that the steps taken would prevent the actual deterioration of the soil.

(7) The eternal One *having manifested,* on the one hand, as the Logos, *manifests,* on the other, as the Root of Matter.

To "manifest" is always transitive. We should have "being manifested," or "having become manifest. . . ."

(8) Taking down a volume, he began to *discuss* on its merits.

To "discuss" is always transitive; so the following pre-

position "on" should be omitted. To "dilate on" or "expatiate on" would be right.

(9) He *suggested* among other things *for* the organisation of a Svadeshi Chamber of Commerce.

To "suggest" is rarely intransitive. The "for" should be omitted.

(10) There is a certain political consciousness *pervading throughout* the whole country, *permeating* even *with* the masses.

Both the verbs are transitive; both the prepositions should be omitted.

(11) To impress upon the Government that the road cess could not *divert* to other purposes.

This intransitive use of to "divert" is quite obsolete.

(12) Two or three years after she *missed,* he received a letter from her.

To "miss" is now used intransitively only in the sense of to fail. The text should have "*was* missed."

(13) The worship *comprised of* reciting verses . . .

"Comprise" is always transitive, so the "of" should be omitted. Or the intransitive "consist" might be used, and the "of" retained.

(14) The suggestion has certainly much to *recommend in* it.

Here also the verb is transitive, and requires an object. The "in" should be omitted. Or we might say "There is much in the suggestion to recommend," when "much" becomes the object of "recommend."

(15) A friend volunteered to *accompany.*

The verb requires an object, such as "me," "him," or as the case may be.

(16) He *deplored that* appeals to racial feelings were often made.

(17) The ryot *deplores that* the rainfall has been very slight.

To "deplore," as now used, is transitive, and requires an object. "Deplores the fact" would do, or an intransitive verb such as "lament" or "grieve" might be substituted.

(18) It *peoples in* the universe with elementals, hobgoblins, etc.

This should be "peoples the universe." The error probably arises from the Indian verb *vas*, which would be used in this connection, being intransitive.

(19) There is no *undoing of* the mischief.

To "undo" is transitive, and requires "the mischief" as its object—"There is no undoing the mischief." There is, indeed, a noun "undoing" which might be followed by "of"; but it is usually used in the sense of ruin.

(20) She *wants* that less prominence should be given to these columns.

(21) I *want* there should be no hypocrisy.

"Want" requires an object. The intransitive "wish" might have been used instead. Or "I want there to be no hypocrisy." And, above, "She wants less prominence to be given."

(22) A document binding the bride's father in a contract so that he may not *defraud* hereafter.

"Defraud" is always transitive, and requires an object, such as, here, the bridegroom's party. Or the phrase "commit fraud" might have been used.

(23) Mrs. Besant herself, had she *re-incarnated* in India, would have been what?

This should be "been re-incarnated," the verb being transitive. So in the next two:—

(24) When Gautama would re-incarnate as Maitreya.

(25) The soul descends to re-incarnate on earth.

(26) The nation seemed to have so much *estranged* from its past.

Similarly here we should say "been estranged," or "become estranged."

(27) To *broach on* the subject.

This should be "to broach the subject."

(28) Civilization had different effects on different countries, and one had to *adapt* to the local circumstances.

To "adapt" is transitive, and requires an object, such as "oneself." But the two clauses do not go conveniently together—the second would be better thus: "And had to be adapted to local circumstances."

(29) To save the country from *wrecking*.

This intransitive use of to "wreck" is not unknown in literature, but according to modern usage we should say "from *being* wrecked."

(30) The writer *addresses* in the following strain.

Some objective as "us" or "his readers" is required after "addresses."

(31) The author *avows* to have been a follower.

To "avow" (except as a legal term) is transitive, and requires an object, as, here, "himself."

(32) The great Sivaji who once more *contested*, and was able to establish his supremacy.

To "contest" was formerly used thus intransitively, but a modern writer would say "contend."

(33) I *regret at* the delay.

To "regret" is transitive, and should govern the object "delay," the preposition being omitted. As in so many similar instances, the *noun* "regret" would be followed by the preposition.

(34) He *betook* to the forest.

This should be "he *betook* himself," according to modern usage, though Spenser sometimes used the verb intransitively.

(35) Unintelligible *to* the West must *strike* the complex story.

To strike, in this sense, is transitive, and requires an object. We should say, "The complex story strikes the West as unintelligible."

(36) Has any conference ever *petitioned to* the Government against the waste of precious life?

We should rather say "petitioned the Government," this verb being rarely used intransitively.

(37) The place where he *reached*.

To "reach" is, in this sense, a transitive verb, and requires an object. "The place *which* he reached," or "the place where he arrived" would be right. See also examples (44) and (45).

(38) Those who wish to *dissociate from* Government altogether.

Here "dissociate" requires an object such as "themselves."

(39) Western influence *permeating down* the strata of English life.

It should be "permeating the strata."

(40) We cannot any longer *suffer* to be guided by them.

"Suffer," in this sense, is transitive, and an object such as "ourselves" is necessary.

(41) Could they possibly *desire for* anything less?

This should be "desire anything less."

(42) We must oppose the Government when we find it *launching into* schemes opposed to the best interests of the people.

There is confusion here between the two expressions "to launch a thing" and "to launch into a thing." Grammatically the sentence is right, but if so taken it does not express what the writer evidently means; for Government *launches* its own schemes—it does not *launch into* ready-made schemes. One may launch (transitively) a vessel, or launch (intransitively) into the sea.

(43) He *encounters* on his coming home *with* the strong and persistent resolution formed in the mind of his wife.

It should be he "encounters the strong . . ."

(44) The news which *reaches* from Coconada.

(45) Sometimes the information *reaches* too late.

"Reach" requires an object. Or the usual expression, "arrives too late," might be used. See also examples (37) and (49).

(46) A vile policy of disintegration *pervaded in* the Brahman and Kayastha societies.

"Pervade," again, is a transitive verb requiring an object. "Pervaded the societies" would be right.

(47) He *emphasised on* the importance of introducing machinery.

As above. Of course, the noun "emphasis" would be rightly followed by "on."

(48) Its chief aim will be to *emphasise upon* the common and true basis of all religions.

Here, again, the preposition should be omitted, though it would be right to say, "lay emphasis *upon*"

(49) The particulars that *reach* from Eastern Bengal require corroboration.

To "reach" is here a transitive verb, and requires an

object, such as "us." Or the intransitive "arrive" might be used. See also examples (44) and (45).

(50) Critics became coadjutors, grumblers began to *thank,* and confusion was replaced by order.

This intransitive use of the verb to "thank" is obsolete.

(51) She *ordered for* the carriage.

The "for" should be omitted, and "carriage" made the object of the verb.

(52) The spirit again *visited,* and said . . .

The verb is transitive and requires an object. To "visit" is used intransitively only in the sense of to keep up the practice of visiting.

(53) The proposal *initiates* with some ardent students.

This verb also is transitive, and requires an object. Either "some ardent students initiated the proposal," or "The proposal was initiated etc." would do. Or, "the proposal *originates* with . . ."

(54) Japan stands out before an *amazing* world, the wonder of wonders.

This use of "amaze" as an intransitive verb is obsolete. We should say, "an *amazed* world."

(55) As soon as he sees some men doing honour to him, he *puffs up* within himself.

To "puff up" is common as a transitive verb, but is not used intransitively. The intransitive to "puff" does not mean to swell, but to breathe or blow hard.

(56) A potent factor in swelling *up* anti-spiritual suggestions.

This is perhaps not wrong, but it is at least unusual to use the adverb "up" with the *transitive* verb to "swell." The intransitive to "swell up" is quite common. This example

is inserted here as in contrast to the one above. But the distinction is not without principle. "Swell" of itself implies enlargement; "puff" does not. Using the two verbs intransitively, "up" is merely intensitive with "swell"; it is meaningless with "puff." Using them transitively "up" is unnecessary with "swell"; it is required with "puff," if the sense of enlargement is to be conveyed.

(57) When a relief lies in our own hands we have to *exert*.

This intransitive use of to "exert" is hardly known to literature, and is not now allowable.

The next examples are of intransitive verbs used transitively :—

(58) How they overcame their difficulties and *pulled through their trials*.

"Pull" is often transitive, but "pull through" is always intransitive, and can take no object after it. You may indeed say "To *pull* a man *through* a difficulty," but that is not a use of the colloquialism to "pull through." On the contrary, "through" is there a preposition, not an adverb.

(59) Intellectual death *supervened* this religious survey and settlement.

"Supervene" is intransitive, and cannot govern an object. The preposition "on" should be inserted, or a word like "follow" substituted.

(60) There may be much to *complain* in their treatment of our people.

Here "complain" is made to govern the noun "much," which it cannot do. "Of" should be inserted after "complain."

(61) The mine-owners will of course have nothing to *complain.*

Similarly here also " of " is required after " complain."

(62) Madhavrau Peshva, a Konkanasth, married a Desasth girl, but the example never *caught on society.*

The colloquial " catch on " is intransitive, and can take no object. " On " is here an adverb, not a preposition. See example (2) page 245.

(63) Wives and sisters who had often to *drudge themselves* to death.

The object " themselves " should be omitted.

(64) Superstition which had *degenerated the great Hindu nation.*

To " degenerate," again, is intransitive, and can take no object—" caused the . . . nation to degenerate " would do.

(65) This school shortly *developed itself* into a regular girls' school.

This is, perhaps, not positively wrong, but the usual expression would be " developed " only. " Develop itself " would be more naturally used of a thing that grows from within and of its own accord, than of a school which can only be developed by external influence.

(66) *Being emanated* from the infinite, we all live in the infinite.

" Emanate " is very rarely used transitively—we should say " Having emanated."

(67) He must ask himself whither the ship is *being drifted.*

To " drift," in this sense, is used only intransitively—" whither the ship is drifting."

(68) This contemplative mood has *drifted* him to inaction.

This should be " has caused him to drift," or, more simply, " has driven him."

(69) He was *reverted* as subordinate judge.

To "revert," when used in this sense and of persons, is not, I think, ever used transitively. "He reverted" would be right.

SECTION III.—MISUSE OF THE DIFFERENT TENSES.

Mistakes as to tenses fall primarily under two heads, namely (1) in independent sentences or clauses, and (2) in complex sentences where the tense required in one clause depends on the tense used in another clause. The mistakes under the first head consist of using

(*a*) The Pluperfect for the Preterite;

(*b*) The Pluperfect for the Perfect;

(*c*) The Preterite for the Pluperfect;

(*d*) The Preterite for the Perfect;

(*e*) Compound Tenses formed with the participle in "-ing" for Simple, Present, or Past Tenses;

and under the second head :—

(*f*) Past Tenses for Present or Future Tenses;

(*g*) Present or Future Tenses for Past Tenses.

(*a*) *The Pluperfect Tense used instead of the Preterite* :—

This is, perhaps, the commonest mistake made by Indian writers of English. It would be hardly too much to say that any average writer might with advantage strike out at least half the "hads" that occur in any piece of his composition. The explanation is of the usual type, namely, that in the majority of Indian languages the pluperfect tense is properly used in many cases where we should use the preterite. For example, it would be correct in Gujarati to say, "*Sikandar hindusthanma avyo hato*," where in English we should say, "Alexander *came* into India"; or in Marathi, to say "*Mavsine majhe vadh divasi hi angthi dili hoti*," where in

English we should say "My aunt *gave* me this ring on my birthday."

The English rule is that the pluperfect tense ("had" or "had been") is used only when three distinct times are present to the mind. These are (1) some past time; (2) an intermediate time; and (3) the time of writing or speaking. And the pluperfect is used only of what occurred at the first of these three times.

In the two sentences given above only two times are, in each instance, present to the mind: the time of Alexander's coming and the time of writing in the first; the time of the birthday gift and the time of speaking in the second. But in either case a preceding or following context, introducing a third time, might make the use of the pluperfect proper in the sentences quoted. Thus it would be correct to say, "By this time Alexander *had come* into India," or "It was known yesterday that my aunt *had given* me the ring on my birthday"

This makes the selection of examples difficult, because the context introducing the third time may either be far removed from the text or may consist of a long narrative. For example:—

(1) The recent events at Comilla have been very unfortunate. Nawab Salimulla *had gone* to the town on a visit.

Here "had gone" is an error for the preterite "went." But that does not necessarily appear from the text as it stands. The writer might have been going to distinguish between the time of the Nawab's going to the town and the riot that took place. It is only on reading what follows that we find that the sentence "Nawab Salimulla had gone to the town on a visit" is the beginning of a narrative of events which should be told all in the same tense. Some of the

examples that follow are similar in this respect, while in others the use of the pluperfect is obviously improper.

(2) Some days ago I *had been* to witness a marriage.

(3) Ignoring in our blindness the fact that it was selfishness and animalism which in the past *had* caused our national decay.

(4) That sympathetic lieutenant-governor, in reply to their deputation, *had* said as follows.

(5) The name Baroda (Vadodara) is derived from Vatpadra. The late Mr. H. H. Dhruva *had* first pointed out this derivation.

(6) Mediaeval history is not without instances when emperors *had* humbled themselves before the house of God.

(7) Free Trade was accepted by England only when her statesmen *had been* convinced that it was to her more advantageous than Protection.

(8) Were there any nationalistic writers before English schools and colleges *had been* established?

(9) The Education Commission of 1882 *had* pointed out that etc.

Here the context (too long for insertion) shows that no reference is made to any intermediate time between the Commission's report and the time of writing.

(10) At the end of my article in the *Calcutta Review,* I *had* remarked.

These are the opening words of an article, and no intermediate time is brought into view.

(*b*) *The Pluperfect Tense used for the Perfect.*

(11) Notwithstanding superficial indications to the contrary, it would be rash to allege that the current *had* changed its direction.

The contemplated allegation is that the current has changed its direction, the period allowed for the change extending right up to the time of the allegation. The perfect tense should therefore have been used. The pluperfect would have

been justified only if some past point of time had been indicated between the time of the possible change and the time of writing.

(12) If his opponents *had* counted upon his humiliation, they are sadly mistaken.

"They are" is in present time, and no intermediate point of time between it and the act of counting is in contemplation; so the "had" should be "have."

(13) We have had two editions of the pamphlet sent to us, but we *had* refrained from noticing them as the statements seemed exaggerated.

Till when had they refrained? Till the time of writing. Therefore the perfect tense, which carries the action up to the time of writing, should have been used.

(14) On former occasions, speaking in this very hall, I *had* compared the conduct of our Government with that of France.

If the speaker regarded the comparison previously made as something in hand applicable to his present argument, he would use the perfect tense "have compared"; or merely regarding it as a past event he might use the preterite "compared." But in neither case is there any occasion for the pluperfect.

(15) The toleration of the Hindus *had* been unique in the religious history of the world. We have never shed blood in the name of religion.

Clearly the writer means "*has* been"—not had been up to a certain date in the past.

(16) Up to this time the unanimous verdict of politicians *had* been that Persia was doomed for ever.

Up to the time of writing is meant, so the perfect tense "has been" is appropriate.

(17) Hindus and Muhammadans, notwithstanding that the two races *had* lived side by side for centuries, have not become friends.

The last verb " have not become " takes us up to the present time, and the living side by side has equally continued to the present. So the " had " should be " have."

(18) In many more cases has the attempt proved a trial to the temper of both teacher and taught, and, by mutual consent, the offending books *had* been thrust into the lumber room.

(19) It should be remembered that the Indian Government *had* always been a scientific guild.

(20) By constant repetition of the word, individuals may come honestly to delude themselves into the belief that the thing *had* been achieved.

(21) Nothing can turn him from a course which he *had* settled in his own mind to be the right one.

(22) This disillusioned man, like the apostate, is never a dispassionate judge of the faith he *had* left.

(23) The institution is to be located in Bangalore, the Maisur Government are prepared to help, and the Government of India *had* all along professed the warmest sympathy.

(24) A non-Esperantist may be spending precious years on a theory which *had* been exploded.

(*c*) *The Preterite Tense used for the Pluperfect:—*

Indians being so much disposed to use the Pluperfect, mistakes under this head are very rare.

(25) For some time past the deceased's health *was* far from satisfactory.

Here we have (1) the time of writing, (2) the time of the decease, (3) the antecedent time; so the pluperfect " had been " is required.

(26) The Imperial forces no sooner retired, than the Sikhs emerged from their fastnesses.

Here also (1) the time of the narration, (2) the time of the

emerging of the Sikhs, and (3) the time of the retiring of the Imperial forces—the last two no doubt very near together but still separate, the expression "no sooner" implying only very rapid succession. The sentence should run: "No sooner *had* the Imperial forces retired than etc."

(27) The association *was* founded scarcely a few years before it had the honour of seeing.

Here we have the time of writing, the time of having the honour, and the still earlier time of being founded; so for "was" we should have "had been." [As to "scarcely a few years," see example (15), page 51. "When" would be a better conjunction than "before" here, as its function is to indicate the point of time at which the event of the principal clause occurred.]

(*d*) *The Preterite Tense used for the Perfect.*

(28) Whereas it *was* deemed desirable to restrict child marriage with a view . . .

This is the beginning of the preamble to the Baroda Marriage Act. It ought to run "it *has been* deemed desirable," because the opinion still prevailed up to the time of enactment.

(29) They have set their faces against the idea of marrying their daughter before she *finished* her education at college.

This should be *has* finished, because the requirement of the subordinate clause is continuous up to the time of the act contemplated, namely, the marriage.

(30) Struggle, struggle, *was* my motto last ten years.

The perfect "has been" again is needed as the motto is retained up to the time of speaking. Had any ten years other than the last been intended, the preterite would have been right.

(31) The Sankaracharya *fell* a victim to cholera, which is severely raging in the district.

If the death had been an event of past history, the preterite "fell" would have been right; but the use of the present in the "is raging" brings the event up to the time of the announcement, and so the perfect, "has fallen," is required.

(32) Sir B. Fuller *was not appointed* lieutenant-governor only for the Muhammadans of East Bengal.

The writer was treating of current events while Sir B. Fuller was still lieutenant-governor, so he should have said "has not been appointed."

(33) No unbeliever *did* anything great in this world by merely playing on the beliefs of others.

The meaning is that up to the present time "no believer has done etc.," so the perfect is necessary. Were such an adverb as "ever" used, the preterite would be right, because the effect of "ever" would be to break the one continuous space of time into separate points of time.

(34) The attempts hitherto made to rouse the community to political life *were* not quite successful.

The effect of "hitherto" is to carry the review of facts up to the present time, so the perfect tense, "have not been," would be appropriate.

(35) Fanaticism leads to all kinds of diabolical methods, which *deluged* the world under the name of religion.

The use of the present tense, "leads," suggests that the review of the methods in question continues up to the time of writing, so the perfect tense, "have deluged," would be better. [As the kinds of methods are defined by the relative clause "which etc.," a native would have written "*those* kinds of . . ."]

(36) The proceedings of the conference, which just *closed* its sittings, were more lively than usual.

"*Has* just closed" would be better, as the review of events is carried up to the time of writing.

(*e*) *Compound Tenses formed with the Participle in "-ing" used for Simple Present or Past Tenses:—*

There is a strong tendency to use tenses formed of the present participle and an auxiliary, instead of simple present or past tenses. In English this use of the present participle is strictly confined to cases in which continuity of action is meant to be expressed. Thus we say "I am learning Greek," "He was building a house," and so on. But in the following examples we should say simply "refer," "commit," "give," instead of "are referring," "be committing," "be giving."

(37) It is not for the first time that we *are referring* to this question.

(38) If people are made to think that they can *be committing* any excess with impunity.

(39) I should *be giving* a one-side account if I were to avoid . . .

So also in the following examples the simple preterite "embraced," etc., should be used instead of the imperfect tense:—

(40) The illustrious and broad-minded Ramanuja, whose warmth of heart *was embracing* the whole range of mankind.

(41) Why were not Lord Curzon and Lord Kitchener prosecuted under that section when they promulgated the statement that soldiers and planters *were* too often *disregarding* the lives of defenceless coolies?

(42) I have dwelt on the subject of education at length; I should have *been failing* in my duty if I had not given its due weight to that topic.

Passing now to clauses (*f*) and (*g*) of those set forth on page 126, it may be mentioned that while mistakes of both kinds are extremely frequent, the great majority of them may be avoided by merely remembering this rule: In a sentence consisting of a principal clause and a dependent clause, *both* the verbs must be in present or future time, or else *both* must be in past time, unless the two verbs express actions taking place at different times. Thus it is correct to say:—

(1) When I see him I know him, or

(2) When I saw him I knew him;

but it is incorrect to say:—

(1) When I see him I knew him;

(2) When I saw him I know him.

Yet these are typical errors, as many of the following examples will show. But when there is really a difference of time in the actions of the two verbs, of course, different tenses are appropriate, as in such a sentence as "I know he was there," *i.e.*, I know now that he was there then.

(*f*) *The Past Tense used for the Present or the Future in complex sentences:*—

(43) If agitators are suppressed, there *would* be no indication of the state of the country.

For "would" we should have "will," as the preceding verb "are" is in present time. If the "are" were changed to "were," the "would" would be right. So also in the next:

(44) We hope that the Association *would* try to give effect to those suggestions.

(45) Now that the baneful effects of that system come to be slowly recognised, it *was* time that . . .

The present tense being used in the first clause, the tense in the second should also be the present.

(46) They are warned that a terrible doom is in store for them if they *did* not let their children go their own way.

(47) The Government cannot go on if the people *did* not pay their taxes.

In both these cases the "did" should be "do."

(48) We hope the association *would* rise to the occasion.

(49) It would not be long before a system *would have been* inaugurated.

In the last two instances we should have "will" and "would be" respectively.

(50) They go cheerfully, happy in the thought that a better life *was* in store for them.

The thought pertains to the time of the first verb "go," so the "was" should be "is."

(51) Resolved that the committee should take such steps as *would* be necessary.

The "should," though preterite in form, is in effect future, and for "would" there should be "may."

(52) Now and again it may so happen that the wrong man *would have received* the help.

This should be "may receive."

(53) If proper men be selected, a good push *would have been* given to public life.

This should be "will be given."

(54) This practice is on the decline. It is hoped that it *would* soon disappear.

(55) Let us hope that the new spirit of national and corporate life *would* go a long way towards stamping out the baneful results of caste antagonisms.

In the last two cases the "would" should be "will."

(56) We are not told what the wife is to do if the commandment *were* broken.

For "were" we should have "is" or "be."

(57) British rule in India will be deprived of one of its most potent justifications if it *ceased* to exercise an unifying influence on the heterogeneous peoples of this country.

For "ceased" we should have "cease."

(58) We are sorry that the futile predictions of our Christian friends *would* bitterly disappoint them.

(59) Such impressions, if they take root in the minds of the general public, *would* prove very harmful.

(60) If matters go on in this stride (way) there *would* soon be a time when girls' fathers *would* be compelled to have recourse to secret infanticide!

In the last three examples all the "woulds" should be "wills."

(61) It will be a valuable benefit to the public if men of Mr. Vishnu's culture and character *came* forward more frequently.

(62) If a man but hold fast to his convictions, things *would* come right in the end.

"Came" should be "come," and "would" "will."

(63) It has to be remembered that, however much the councils *might* expand, they must always have an official majority.

"It has to be remembered" expresses present time, so the "might" should be "may."

(64) Our salutations go to all the past prophets, whose teachings and lives we have inherited, whatever *might* have been their race and clime.

"Go" is in present time, so the "might" should be "may."

(65) The law lays its firm grasp on all offenders, to whatever class they *might* belong.

This is similar.

(66) It will be some time before he *realised* his mistake.

This should be "before he *realises*."

(67) They keep their minds open to truth from whatever direction it *might* come.

"Keep" is in present time, so "might" should be "may."

(68) All these learned professors must be sent out of India, in order that their eyes *might* be opened to the whole world.

"Must" here is expressive of necessity, and does not indicate past time (see page 115); so the following "might" should be "may."

(69) It is better that we should be hypnotised into some such belief, than that the controversy should be kept open until everyone *got* heartily tired of it.

"Got" should be "get."

(70) If neither the Government nor our popular leaders have a high opinion of our mamlatdars, the sooner we *took* steps to secure a better class of those officers, the better.

"Took" should be "take."

(71) India is dragged before the great tribunal of the world, and is condemned because she *would* not explain.

(72) It is generally expected that the Government *would* assign a leading place to the revival of the hand-loom industry.

"Would" in these two examples should be "will."

(73) The law is thus made as harmless as *could* be desired.

"Could" should be "can."

(74) It will be dangerous to allow things to drift, for unless a bold definite stand *was* taken, they are likely to sink back into orthodoxy.

"Was" should be "be."

(75) Unless the heart and the head work together in harmony, no permanent progress *could* be possible.

"Could" should be "can" or "will."

(76) Compare this song with the poems of Fiona McLeod, and the influence of the French poet *would*

(76) We are thankful to Mr. Ellis for so eloquently pleading the cause of India, and we trust that he *would* continue pleading . . .

In the last two examples the "would" should be "will."

(77) Victor Hugo was the first *to have taken* liberties with the established forms of French poetry.

This should be "was the first *to take*." This may seem to be an exception to the general rule, because the preceding verb "was" is in the past tense; but the predication is of a quality regarded as existing at the time indicated by the verb.

(78) The tools of self-government have to be got ready before we *could* successfully carry on the work.

The "could" should be "can." So also in the next:—

(79) All this requires to be largely modified before we could be welded into a great nation.

(80) He never seemed *to have been* conscious of his greatness.

We should say "he never seemed to be conscious of his greatness." For the time of the consciousness is the same as the time of the seeming. The use of the past infinitive "to have been" has the effect of expressing that it was a *former* state of feeling that was apparent.

(81) It was a wise thing that the public men of Lahore did in *having* openly *disclaimed* any sympathy with the recent acts of lawlessness in that city.

Similarly this should be "in openly disclaiming"; for the time of the disclaimer was the same as that of the preceding verb "did." That is to say, the verb "did" takes us back to a certain time at which the disclaimer was a *present* act.

(*g*) *The Present or Future Tense used for the Past:*—

(82) If all communities would agree upon a common line of action, their action *will* have an electrical effect.

The " will " should be " would," as the past form " would " is used in the first clause. Had the verb in the first clause been " will agree," the " will " in the second clause would have been right. A corresponding remark applies to all the following examples, and in each case the " will " should be changed to " would," the " can " to " could," " seems " to " seemed," " may " to " might," and so on.

(83) If there were young men thirsting for higher education, high schools and colleges *will* spring up.

(84) If cases of conflict were confined to . . . they would be intelligible, though even then they *cannot* but be reprehensible.

(85) There was a time when Lord Curzon *seems* to have been confident of taking the public with him.

(86) If young men turned their attention to the vast field of human feelings, our languages *will* soon possess a literature of which

(87) The eulogium would be entitled to greater weight if it *can*

(88) If a search were made in the records, we *may* find further particulars.

(89) If we could only stop this custom of infant marriage by degrees, we *shall* be emancipated from several evils.

(90) The *Madras Mail* predicted some time ago that prices of produce *will* fall.

(91) If the partition of Bengal were rescinded to-day, the Svadeshi movement *will* not be given up.

(92) If British statesmen only remembered that India is listening to their orations, they *will* pause in their eloquence.

(93) If woman should realise her position, and effectively demand her rights from man, man *can* not help complying with her wishes.

(94) One was inclined to believe that special enquiries *will* put an end to unlawful conduct.

(95) Signatures that could be obtained without the signatories knowing what they *are* signing.

(96) If these were to come, we *shall* be less dependent.

(97) If the above were a fairly correct representation of the aims of the Extremists, then it *may* be added that the scheme is susceptible of unlimited expansion.

In this last example, assuming the first clause to be correct, the second verb is wrong; but the writer probably meant "If the above *be* a fairly correct representation . . .," and if he had written so then the following "may" would have been right.

SECTION IV.—MISUSE OF THE GERUND FOR THE INFINITIVE AND VICE VERSA.

It is sometimes a matter of indifference whether we use a gerund or an infinitive. For example, we may say either "an opportunity *of going*" or an "opportunity *to go*." But usually one or other is preferable, and sometimes one or other is obligatory. The matter is one of much difficulty, and native as well as Indian writers often use the wrong form. The tendency on the part of the former is to use the infinitive too much, while Indian writers show a partiality for the gerund (as they do also for the participle in *-ing*, which is of the same form as the gerund). It is not easy to lay down any principles to which many exceptions could not be found; but I would suggest the two following rules as being of some practical use:—

1. When a preposition has or ought to be used before the word in question—gerund or infinitive—the gerund should be adopted.

Thus we should say, "Prevent him from going," not "Prevent him to go"; "Aim at acquiring," not "Aim to acquire."

2. When the antecedent word (it may be noun, verb, or adjective) combines with the word in question to convey the sense of a single action or state of being, the infinitive is usually preferable.

Thus we say, "Attempt to destroy," "Tendency to melt," "Try to speak," "Ready to learn." But, on the contrary, "Avoid speaking," "Averse to learning," where there is some opposition between the action or condition expressed by the two words. And such phrases as "He failed to pass," "He refused to go away," are not truly exceptions to this rule; for the force of the first verbs ("fail" and "refuse") is rather to *negative* the action of the following verb than to suggest any independent action of a different kind. But when the antecedent word is a noun, and especially if it be particularised by the definite article, the gerund becomes more allowable. Thus, though we must say "I hope (verb) *to succeed*," we should say, "I have no hope (noun) *of succeeding*." "*A* power *of legislating*" and "*A* power *to legislate*" are perhaps equally good; but "The power of legislating" is more natural than "The power to legislate."

The following examples come under the first rule, where a preposition is required, and therefore the gerund, and not the infinitive, should be employed:—

(1) I have great pleasure *to second* the proposal.

This should be "in seconding . . ."

(2) The Poona Widows' Home has succeeded *to win* much sympathy.

This should be "in winning . . ."

(3) Professor Karve has the satisfaction *to find*.

"Of finding" would be better.

(4) The hindrance should be removed by preventing bachelors *to marry* girls at too early an age.

" From marrying " is wanted.

(5) The University restrictions have succeeded *to deprive* the students of their independence.

This should be " in depriving."

(6) " Do not be indifferent *to do* this," is a piece of advice given as an exhortation to pay more attention to the thing in charge.

Here we want " about (or concerning) doing this."

(7) India has, throughout her varied history, shown an invetorate tenacity *to maintain* her integral existence.

" In maintaining " would be better.

(8) The Kayasthas were for a long time aiming *to classify* themselves as Kshatriyas.

This should be " at classifying . . ."

(9) We shall have done our duty *to stem* the tide of social and moral evil.

" In stemming " would be better.

(10) Education must aim *to give* a moral constitution to the child.

This should be " at giving."

(11) The old are offended *to notice* that the younger generation is not true to the traditions of their forefathers.

This should be " at noticing."

(12) It is born of a deep-rooted sentiment *to develop* the material resources of this country without alien support.

The word sentiment is expressive of feeling itself without any suggestion of a disposition to pass into outward action: we cannot, therefore, speak of a " sentiment to develop,"

but some such preposition as "towards" or "in favour of" is required and consequently the gerund instead of the infinitive.

(13) A woman is prohibited to *re-marry*.

This should be "from remarrying."

(14) The Grihastha section was not unanimous *to espouse* his cause.

We should say "in espousing . . ."

The next examples come under the second rule, and in each case the infinitive should be substituted for the gerund:—

(15) We should be given sufficient legislative power *for preventing* fraud.

(16) A spirit to do one's utmost *for imparting* education to women.

(17) There is a great tendency of the intellect of the nation *being* unduly *diverted* to one channel only.

(18) If they had cared *for clearing* their position.

(19) Both Hindus and Muhammadans joined together *for making* a petition to Government.

(20) *For attaining* the object in view, our leaders should keep it carefully out of sight.

(21) He called the ministers to the palace *for* further *discussing* the plan.

(22) I proceeded to Amreli *for introducing* compulsory education.

(23) The orthodox began to refuse *sending* their children to school.

(24) Three delegates sail for England to-morrow *for stumping* that country.

(25) A party of Hindu gentlemen, with Mrs. Besant *for pleading* their cause.

(26) Arrange for mass meetings *for giving* expression to the views of the people.

(27) One must peruse the original *for realising* in full its mastery over our hearts.

(28) The proposal made *for inviting* half a dozen editors.

(29) On the eve of her departure *for residing* in her father-in-law's family.

(30) Surrendering the fruits of conquest and personal glory *for evolving* a contented and consolidated kingdom.

(31) The Svadeshi movement aims at educating the people so as to make them fit *for taking* full advantage of the rich stores . .

(32) The whole province will feel proud to do its best *for raising* a suitable memorial.

(33) Strenuous endeavours *for enlisting* the sympathy of the Muhammadans.

(34) What he would like the Government and the people to do *for developing* the industrial resources of the country.

(35) He resolutely worked *for welding* the various rival interests into a unity of devotion to the empire.

(36) There was a tendency *of giving* a practical and definite shape to social system.

(37) The infirmities of age had been got the better of by an intense curiosity *for witnessing* a demonstration which . . .

(38) With the result that Russia admitted Afghanistan *lying* outside the sphere of her influence.

(39) It is incumbent on the Hindus, as the politically more advanced race, *by showing* greater forbearance and self-sacrifice for their Muhammadan brethren.

It will be observed generally of the above group of examples that the force of the infinitive (as required in them) is to express the fulfilment of the tendency or the obligation or the endeavour or the purpose, the existence of which is indicated by the previous word. And, in particular, that wherever the force of the phrase " in order to " is applicable, an infinitive will always follow, as in examples (21), (22), (24), (26), (27), (30), (34).

A good illustration of this difference between the force of the infinitive and that of the gerund is furnished by the next two examples :—

(40) The best way *of ascertaining* the causes, character, and extent of the wrong is through a royal commission.

This is not wrong, but the infinitive would be preferable. On the other hand, in such phrases as "the best way of disposing of the matter" or "the best way of folding a turban" the infinitive is not to be preferred. The distinction is that where there is no question of the result being arrived at, and attention is fixed rather on the choice of *ways* by which to arrive at it, the gerund is permissible; but where the object is to reach an end which may or may not be attained (as in the text), attention is attracted more by the *purpose* in view, and the infinitive is preferable.

Again, observe the respective propriety of each form as exemplified in the following sentence: The best way *to get* an appointment is to qualify oneself for it, and the best way *of setting* to work when the appointment is obtained is to . . .

(41) We only hope that the police have been doing their best *in finding* out the culprits.

This is grammatically correct if the writer assumes that the police were engaged in finding out the culprits, and means only to express the hope that they were doing their best in that task; but he more probably means that he hopes they were doing their best *to find* out the culprits.

(42) Our really independent reviewers seem still to hesitate *in dealing* with it.

This is correct English, but to hesitate *in doing* a thing is not quite the same as to hesitate *to do* it. The first connotes inception of the act; the second does not.

(43) The Sabba may be expected to do what the Government have hitherto failed *in doing*.

Here "to do" is clearly needed, as there has been no doing of the thing in question.

(44) A message to do their best *in promoting* the economic independence of Baroda.

If the work of promotion be in progress, we may speak of one doing his best *in* that work; but no doubt the writer here means "to do their best *to promote*," regarding the work as one still to be entered upon.

Now in the next two examples there is rather opposition between the actions of the two verbs employed than such fusion of the one with the other as has been noticed above under the second rule, and therefore the infinitive should be changed to the gerund:—

(45) If he avoids *to take* legal steps.

(46) Indians should not obstruct in any manner *to raise* a memorial to Clive.

The infinitive and not the gerund is always used when the pronoun "it" is put in to represent the subject or object subsequently placed in apposition to the "it." Thus: "*It* gives me pleasure *to propose* . . ." though, otherwise, "I have pleasure *in proposing* . . ."; "Make *it* a point *to be* there," though, otherwise, "Make a point *of being* there"; "*It* was my intention *to speak*," though, otherwise, "I had the intention *of speaking*." Thus in the following example either the "it" should be omitted or the gerund should be changed to the infinitive.

(47) The Reform Associations should make *it* a point *of acquainting* every family . . .

There are some cases in which the error in using the gerund for the infinitive is due to a consideration not of sense but of grammatical form. The word following the comparative conjunction "than" should be of the same grammatical status as the word preceding it. In the next examples the verb preceding "than" is in the infinitive mood (the auxiliary "can" takes the infinitive without the preposition "to") and therefore the following verb should be infinitive also :—

(48) We cannot do better than *securing* the help of these leaders.

(49) Government cannot do worse than *neglecting* its obligations in such matters.

Here follow a few examples in which the infinitive is wrongly used not instead of the gerund but instead of the present participle with the conjunction "as." For "to possess," "to be," etc., we should have "as possessing," "as being," etc.

(50) The Brahmans can never pose *to possess* any real superiority over them.

(51) A neutral attitude does not strike one *to be* particularly heroic.

(52) Agitation is regarded by the Government *to be* the necessary result of British rule.

(53) The author of it is described *to be* closely familiar with the Panjab.

CHAPTER X.

SYNTAX.

THIS chapter is divided into the following five sections:—(1) Errors as to the position of the verb in relation to the subject; (2) Other errors as to the order of words in a sentence; (3) Errors of construction affecting the meaning of a sentence; (4) Errors in particular idioms and in the use of titles; and (5) Other errors in the construction of sentences.

SECTION I.—ERRORS AS TO THE POSITION OF THE VERB IN RELATION TO THE SUBJECT OF A SENTENCE.

Ordinarily the subject (noun, pronoun, etc.) of a sentence precedes the verb or predicate, as "The man is alive," "Cows eat grass." But there are many exceptions to this rule, namely (*a*) Interrogative sentences; (*b*) Certain negative or quasi-negative sentences; (*c*) Certain conditional sentences; and (*d*) Cases in which for the sake of emphasis, or to make the sentence balance better, a word (or words) is removed from its normal position and put at the head of the sentence.

(*a*) *Interrogative Sentences.*

To express an interrogation the ordinary order is inverted, and the verb, or the auxiliary part of it, is placed before the noun or subject, as "Is the man alive?" "Do cows eat grass?" "Breathes there a man with soul so dead?" In the following examples this rule has been overlooked, and the affirmative instead of the interrogative form used:—

(1) Were the members armed with pistols? And *they all proclaimed* a crusade against anybody?

This should be "Did they all etc.?"

(2) "What *they could* be carrying?" said the King.

Instead of "What could they be carrying?"

(3) Why not the rest co-operate and work?

Instead of "Why *do* not the rest etc.?"

(4) Whose monies they exploited for their trade purposes?

Instead of "*Did* they exploit?"

(5) Why not India rise like Japan?

Instead of "Why *does* not etc.?"

In the next example the mistake is of a different character. The auxiliary "could" is correctly put before the subject to indicate the interrogation; but the effect of putting the rest of the verb ("have been") also before the subject is to change the subject into the objective, and make "what else" the subject:—

(6) What else could have been the official Universities of India?

(7) Why not you train them in pious and devotional ways?

Instead of "Why *do* you not . . .?"

(8) Why not the Hindu Association canvass and find out how many of its members are for following the wholesome principle?

Here also "Why *does* not . . ." is the proper order.

But the opposite mistake is sometimes made, and the interrogative order used where the affirmative is required. This is no doubt often due to the Indian idiom of using direct narration where in English the indirect is used. Where, for instance, an Englishman would say "Ask him where his father is," an Indian would say "Ask him where is your

father?" The following are examples of the error:—

(9) By that devotion deep, from darkness free,
What am I like, and what the soul *doth see.*

"What am I like?" is correct as a question, but we cannot say "Doth see what am I like" when there is no interrogation. That is an Indian idiom. The English form is "Doth see what I am like?"

(10) What is Hinduism it is very difficult to define.

Similarly this should be "What Hinduism is etc.," no question being put.

(11) Those who could not understand what was Brahmaism.

Here again, "What Brahmaism was."

(12) I know what's love; I've read English fiction.

The same mistake—"What love is."

(13) They do not pause to consider what *is the loss* to humanity.

Here also the sentence is not interrogative, and the inversion is wrong. The order should be "what the loss to humanity is."

(14) They are wondering why *is the Government* taking drastic steps.

(15) All parties should pause to inquire why *is it* that there is so much panic everywhere.

(16) We shall hear what *are its conclusions* in due course.

In all these cases also the subject should precede the predicate.

(*b*) *Negative Sentences.*

Sentences or clauses introduced by a negative (such as "not," "neither," "nor") require (like interrogative sentences) that the verb, or its auxiliary, should precede the noun or pronoun which is the subject of the verb. All

the following eight examples require amendment under this rule :—

(17) Not unless the individual citizen is imbued with the constitutional spirit, *it is* impossible to work any constitutional form of Government satisfactorily.

Here the order should be " is it "; and, the negation being already made by the " not," instead of " impossible " we should have " possible." See example (61), page 202.

(18) But these arguments are not sufficiently strong to warrant the conclusion, nor *they have* the capability of carrying conviction.

The order should be " have they."

(19) No sooner *it flies* back to the jungle than it gives out its own wild note.

This should be " *does* it fly back."

(20) No sooner *the resolution was* communicated to Government than the latter assumed an imperious tone.

This should be " was the resolution . . ."

(21) Not only *I feel* but I hear.

This should be " Not only *do* I feel."

(22) No longer *the members* of different castes *confine* themselves to

This should be " No longer *do* the members . . ."

(23) A bear dance could not amuse the public more nor *any other form* of unrestrained mimicry *could* disgust them so much.

The " could " of the second clause should immediately follow the conjunction " nor."

(24) India is not yet a consolidated whole; not even *Bengal is*.

The second clause, if separated by a semi-colon, should be " nor even is Bengal." Or it might be placed in apposition to the first clause (separated by a dash) in the form " even Bengal is not."

In the next example the opposite mistake is made :—

(25) The time seems to us to have come when *no longer can we* postpone any decided action.

Here the inverted order is wrong, because it is not the negative "no longer" but the conjunction "when" that introduces the clause. The order should be "when we can no longer . . ."

But besides actual negatives there are certain words of a quasi-negative or privative character which also require inversion of the subject and predicate. Such a word, for example, is "seldom"; for when we affirm that a thing seldom happens, we are in effect affirming that in most cases it does *not* happen. Shelley's lines—

"Rarely, rarely, cŏmest thou
Spirit of Delight!"

is an illustration of this. So in the following examples the order of the subject and predicate should be changed :—

(26) Seldom *gladness comes* to brighten the gloomy path that the widow has to tread alone.

The order should be : "Seldom does gladness come."

(27) Much less *there should* be any feeling of antagonism between the two sections.

The proper order is "should there be . . ."

(c) *Conditional Sentences.*

Besides the interrogative and the negative forms considered above, there is another class of sentences in which it is necessary that the verb, or the auxiliary part of it, should precede the subject of the sentence. That is, conditional sentences in which the conditional conjunction is omitted, as in Byron's lines :—

"O could I feel as I have felt,
Or be what I have been,
Or weep as I could once have wept
O'er many a vanished scene."

Here observe "could I feel" is not a question, but is equivalent to "if I could feel"; and so of "be" and "weep" in the next lines. So in the following example the "could" ought to be the second word in the sentence :—

(28) And Mr. Gokhale and the Hindu leaders of his way of thinking *could* only persuade their followers to practise what they themselves preach, the entente cordiale between the Hindus and Muhammadans would be an accomplished fact.

(*d*) *Cases in which for the sake of emphasis, or to make the sentence balance better, a word or phrase is removed from its normal position and put at the head of the sentence.*

The inversion of the usual order of the noun and verb is very frequent in such cases. For example, the following five lines—in each of which it occurs, though in one of them the inversion is required also under head (*b*) of this section —are all taken from Wordsworth's short poem on the picture of Peele Castle :—

"Ah ! then if mine *had been the painter's hand.*"

* * * *

"A picture *had it* been of lasting ease."

* * * *

"Such picture *would I* at that time have made

* * * *

"Not for a moment *could I* now behold."

* * * *

"Well chosen *is the spirit* that is here."

And it may be observed that if the word taken to the beginning of the sentence is the object of the verb (as in the third of the above lines), or is the thing predicated of the subject (as in the first, second, and fifth lines), the inversion is natural; because in each case the verb is the link between the subject and the object, or between the subject and the thing predicated, and should therefore occupy the middle place. But any part of speech, even an adverb, if it be emphasised by being put at the beginning of the sentence, is sufficient to render inversion appropriate, as in such phrases as "Gladly did he go," "Bitterly did he repent." In the following examples it would have been better to put the verb (or the auxiliary part of it) before the noun or pronoun:—

(29) Especially *the telegram* about the desecration of certain Hindu idols *is* more disquieting.

(30) So peculiar *it is* as a matter of fact that all parties may seem justified in all that they have done.

(31) As well *we might* protest against an increase in the revenue.

Several striking examples of this idiom will be found in Scott's poem of "Rosabelle," such as—

"Soft is the note, and sad the lay."

* * * *

"Blazed battlement and pinnet high."

But occasionally inversion of the subject and predicate is resorted to, not for emphasis, but to make the sentence hold together better. This is especially the case where the subject consists of a string of nouns the enumeration of which is unintelligible until the predication is heard. Thus if a dozen names of persons are to be given as among those present at a meeting, and the ordinary order of subject and

predicate be adopted, the reader is at a loss as to the writer's intention till he gets to the end of the sentence. But if the writer began "Among those present were . . .," then the reader would know whether it was worth while to read through the names or not. And in the following example an Indian writer has correctly used inversion merely to make the sentence balance better :—

(32) Healthy ideas of this kind are now gathering in strength and in their greater and more widespread influence must be read the real advance of the country.

And a good example of this usage is furnished by the following passage :—

"Such as was the dominion of the Romans in the East, such must be that of England in India."

In the next example inversion is erroneously adopted in the first clause, but is rightly used in the second :—

(33) The more comprehensive *is his view* of his duties towards the people, the greater will be his contribution to their contentment.

SECTION II.—OTHER ERRORS AS TO THE ORDER OF WORDS IN A SENTENCE.

(1) He is reported to have cursed *that Macaulay's minute* which has been our emancipation.

The pronoun belongs to "minute," not to Macaulay; so the order should be "that minute of Macaulay's."

(2) He also dwelt *upon*, with admirable ability, *the works* of Bengalis.

A preposition should not be thus separated from its case.

(3) If it *not be* the ground on which opposition is based.

The negative "not" must be placed after the verb, or after the auxiliary in the case of a compound verb.

(4) No impression than that the authorities are siding with the Muhammadans can be more mischievous.

The comparative "more mischievous" should precede the conjunction "than."

(5) Mr. Petrie's *new interesting* book on the republic of Columbia.

A native would not write this. He would either say "new *and* interesting" or "interesting new." And for this reason: The adjective "new" following the author's name suggests that there was another book by the same author distinguished from this book by being older; but the adjective "interesting" in the same position does not suggest that there was another book distinguished from this one by being less interesting. Thus "interesting new" says only that the book is interesting and that it is new—which is all the writer means to say. But "new interesting" suggests that there was an old interesting book—a statement which the writer does not pretend to make.

(6) His brilliant article in the *Quarterly Review* last.

The adjective "last" should precede the name.

(7) By endangering its trade, and by similar other methods.

The order should be "by other similar methods," the similarity pertaining to the methods and not to the adjective "other."

(8) In the olden times the inquisitive soul for news applied to the old woman of the village.

"For news" is governed by "inquisitive," and the order should be "the soul inquisitive for news."

(9) He is likely to make almost an ideal secretary of state for India.

The "almost" belongs wholly to "ideal," and in no degree

to "secretary," so the order should be "an almost ideal secretary."

(10) The relation of cause and effect between the scheme and the hopes of the college does not evidently lie on the surface.

"Does not evidently lie" might be taken to be in contra-distinction to "apparently lies." The order should be "evidently does not lie."

(11) The real object with which these Sabhas are held is not so much apparently to arrive at a satisfactory solution as to . . .

Similarly the order here should be "is apparently not so much . . ."

(12) But custom, any more than an act of parliament, cannot eradicate indolence.

The expression "any more than" requires a negative to have gone *before* it. "But custom cannot . . ." is the right order.

(13) Especially for agricultural improvement, he has done much for which the people will ever remember him.

The main predication "he has done much" should precede the specialised attributive. Or if, for the sake of emphasis, it is desired to begin with the latter, then the main clause would have to be inverted to "has he done." See Section I., subhead (*d*) of this chapter.

(14) Since *at least* the time of his grandfather charity has run in the blood of the family.

The "at least" refers to the measurement of time, and the measurement is by generations, so the better order would be "Since the time of his grandfather at least."

(15) All observe caste so far as marriage *at least* is concerned.

The "at least" qualifies "so far," and should be placed next to it, either before or after.

(16) The major portion of the cost *at least* will be borne by Government.

This should be "At least the major portion etc."

(17) The army has had its own critics since *at least* the late South African war.

"At least since etc." would be better.

(18) Brahmacharini girls whose parents have pledged not to marry them till at least they are sixteen.

The "at least" has nothing to do with the pronoun "they," and should be put either just before or just after the "sixteen" which it qualifies. (The verb "to pledge" is transitive, and requires an object such as "their word" or "themselves.")

(19) If an impetus for promoting social reform should *at all* emanate from any place in India, it should be from Bombay.

The "at all" should come just after "place"—it has no bearing on the verb "emanate."

(20) How to manage a house on Rs.100 a month with at least a saving of Rs.5 a month and with four little ones.

The "four little ones" pertain to the house, but are placed a long way off, where they seem to be on a par with the saving of Rs.5. The "at least" again pertains not to the saving but to the figure Rs.5. The order should be "How to manage a house with four little ones on Rs.100 a month, and with a saving of at least Rs.5 a month."

(21) A new-born sun where sheds its gleam.

This is an impossible order in English—the relative conjunction "where" must come at the beginning of the clause which it governs.

(22) Not a single one of the offending officers has been punished. It has been *even* stated that one of them has been promoted.

The effect of putting the adverb "even" where it is is to lay stress on the fact that a certain *statement* has been made, whereas obviously the stress should be on the *fact of promotion*. The sentence should end "has even been promoted." (The adverb should not come between the auxiliary and the verb.)

(23) Sternly set their faces *even* against an appearance of speaking to the gallery.

This should be "against even an appearance . . ." the intention no doubt being to lay stress on an *appearance* as compared with an *actual speaking* to the gallery.

(24) Distribution by the aid of willing friends or by *even* agents who get a small commission.

The "even" here is attached to the word which it qualifies, but its position between the preposition and the noun makes it appear as an adjective. The phrase should be "even by agents," or "by agents even."

(25) Sacrifice of cherished prejudices, sacrifice of *even* parts of tradition.

Similarly this should be "sacrifice even of parts of tradition."

(26) Parasu Rama did not simply reclaim the territory, but peopled it, gave it laws . . . and had *even* coins struck.

Here also the order should be "even had coins struck." As it stands the passage reads as if among other things struck he included even coins.

(27) I therefore beseech Babu Surendranath to kindly consider the seriousness of the situation and forego if necessary *even* the Bombay meeting. Nor is it necessary that *even* he should forego the meeting.

The "even" is in each sentence wrongly placed. There

was no question whether the Bombay meeting or another meeting should be foregone; nor any question whether Babu Surendranath or some one else was to forego anything. The " even " pertains neither to the meeting to be foregone, nor to the person who should forego it, but, in each case, to the act of foregoing. The first " even " should have been placed just before the verb " forego," and the second just before the clause " that he should forego."

> (28) To say nothing of works of the highest merit, Gujarat can hardly boast *even* a large number of second-rate literary productions.

Not " even a large number . . ." but " a large number of even second-rate literary productions " is obviously meant.

> (29) In 1891, in the same province, 10.8 were literate or learners; *even* in Bombay and Madras, which gave higher figures, they reached 14 and 14.9, while for all India the total is 10.9 only.

The position of " even " suggests that Bombay and Madras would naturally be expected to be behind the other provinces; but what the writer means is presumably that in Bombay and Madras the figures " reached even 14 and 14.9."

> (30) Those who could talk glibly but did not evidently understand the alphabet of . . .

The proper order would be " evidently did not understand," because " evidently " is meant to qualify the whole clause and not the verb " understand " only.

> (31) The establishment of more technical institutes, agricultural farms, the award of more liberal scholarships to enable bright Indian students to go and study the improved methods of commerce and agriculture, etc., in foreign countries, by the Government, will be most helpful to us.

Here " by the Government " depends on the word "establishment," and should be placed much nearer to it.

(32) The movement is sure to be opposed by those whose vested interests it may injure, and the opposition of the British manufacturers and merchants is in itself enough to crush to death the slender beginnings of a movement under its heels.

The sentence ends very awkwardly—"under its heels" should follow immediately on "crush to death."

(33) One can easily imagine what dreadful pests the Thugs were of society.

"Of society" qualifies "pests," and should come next to that word.

(34) I will take the matters that have caused Lord Curzon's unpopularity by turn.

This would be better thus: "I will take in turn the matters . . ." as the "by turn" qualifies "take" and not "caused."

(35) Incapable of any better destiny than their masters wished them for.

This should be "wished for them," the object of "wished" being, not "them" but "the destiny which" (understood).

(36) He was judicially blind as to who the person was before him.

"Before him" is not part of the predication, but is merely attributive to "person," which it should immediately follow

(37) There will be hardly really any serious general fear on this ground.

Probably what is meant is that "there will really be hardly any . . ." the "really" qualifying the verb, and the "hardly" qualifying the adjective "any."

(38) Social reformers are carrying on partly an unsuccessful struggle.

The order should be "a partly unsuccessful struggle," with the adverb next the adjective which it qualifies.

(39) Preparation for entry into *another* world *yet*.

This should be "yet another world," the adverb (which expresses *addition* to something) pertaining to the adjective "another," not to the noun "world."

(40) Agriculture is the chief support *nearly of* the whole population.

Similarly this should be "of nearly the whole," the adverb qualifying the "whole" and not the "of."

(41) Mr. Karsandas uniformly held before him the scales of justice even.

The term "before him" seems hardly to be required. If inserted at all it should come after "even." In the text it has the effect of separating the "even" too far from the verb "held."

(42) Though little more than of middle stature, Akbar seemed to tower above the rest.

This should be "of little more than middle stature." As the sentence is written it is capable of the interpretation that there was little more to notice about Akbar than that he was of middle stature.

(43) Hamlet failed as a reformer, since only in the end he brought his uncle to punishment.

Presumably the "only" is intended to apply not to the phrase "in the end" but to the clause "he brought . . .," in which case the order should be "Since in the end he only . . ."

(44) Suppose that a large measure of self-government be granted to us, shall we not be called upon to show quite ourselves worthy of the trust?

"Quite" qualifies "worthy," and should not be separated from it.

(45) The rates still are so exorbitant.

The question is not as to the rates continuing to exist, but as to their continuing to be so exorbitant. The adverb "still" should therefore come next to the "so exorbitant."

SECTION III.—ERRORS OF CONSTRUCTION AFFECTING THE MEANING OF A SENTENCE.

(1) One who differs from the views of Sir P. Mehta need be neither a fool nor a knave.

Taken literally this would amount to the strange statement that one who differs from the views in question cannot be either a fool or a knave. What is meant of course is that such a person need not be either a fool or a knave. The use of "either—or" distributes the preceding negative; the use of "neither—nor" does not distribute the preceding positive. The peculiar habit of the verb to "need" in rejecting, in this idiom, both its own personal termination and the "to" of the infinitive used with it, will be noticed —"he need be" instead of "he needs to be." See example (47), page 182.

(2) Vested interests, hereditary prejudices, etc., *gather ahead* like dark clouds.

This is grammatically correct, but one cannot help feeling that the writer meant to say "gather to a head." For the forces in question are old, and there is no particular point in saying they gather *ahead;* but it may be that new movements cause them to gather *to a head.*

(3) Haeckel's "Riddle of the Universe" may be purchased almost for the price of a cup of coffee.

This first suggests to the mind a price approximating to, but not reaching, that of a cup of coffee. But nothing of

the kind is intended. Instead of "almost for" we should say "for little more than."

(4) The hawker in Kashmir is often as interesting as a juggler *all over* India.

Apparently "anywhere in India" is what is meant. "All over India" is rather equivalent to "*every*where in India."

(5) It is the fit time for the new government to inaugurate at any rate, to mature, new schemes.

Perhaps the meaning intended is "to mature, or at any rate to inaugurate, new schemes."

(6) As in Upper India and Bengal, our women are not fettered by the strict parda system.

The clause introduced by "as" being thus placed at the head of the sentence qualifies the *whole* of it, and the inference is that women in Upper India and Bengal are not fettered etc.; but what the writer means no doubt is that the women of Bombay are not fettered as those of Upper India and Bengal *are*.

(7) It is hardly *credible* for us now *to read* the bitter mock a troubadour would freely lance against the excesses of the court of Rome.

Passing over the words "mock" and "lance" now almost, if not quite, obsolete as used here, the sentence is not of happy construction, because it is not the act of reading but the substance read that is hardly credible. It might have run "What we now read as to . . . is hardly credible."

(8) It is *remarkable to note* that the absence of a middle class has been a most glaring defect in the development of ancient communities.

The fact mentioned may be remarkable, but to note it is not remarkable.

(9) It is *remarkable to notice* how little attempt has been made to understand British Institutions.

What is remarkable is not the notice but the littleness of the attempt. Either the words "to notice" should be omitted, or some such expression as "worth while" should be substituted for "remarkable."

(10) The number of visitors and delegates this year was by far the largest of any previous year.

As the number this year was distinct from those of previous years it could not be one of them at all; therefore it could not be the largest of them. It would have been correct to say the largest of any year," or to say "larger than that of any previous year."

(11) No iniquities are too unrighteous to revolt against their national code of morality.

Probably the meaning intended to be expressed is that their code of honour is so low that no iniquity is bad enough to cause a shock to it; but the sentence cannot be said to convey that meaning.

(12) Cobwebs and soots are cleaned and the rooms brushed.

Not the cobwebs and the soot, but the walls etc. on which they rest, are cleaned. (As to "soots," see page 89.)

(13) We mistake the unreal *as* the real, and fail to see the path.

This would mean "We mistake the unreal as we mistake the real"; for "as" is never a preposition. The word should be "for."

(14) They would not only *deny* any sympathy with the reform movement, but would even protest against it.

The verb "deny" has a great variety of meanings, and it is not quite clear which of two of them is intended here. If it is meant in the sense of to *refuse* or *withhold*, as in the

expression "to deny assistance," then it should be followed by the preposition "to" instead of "with." But if, as seems more probable, it is meant in the sense of denying *the existence* of sympathy, then that is a very rare use, and it would be better to say "deny that they were in sympathy with." The "denial" of a statement does not mean that the statement has not been *made*, but that it is not *true*.

(15) It is the work of a life-time—if even that—to master all branches of mathematics.

"If even that," by itself suggests that some shorter time might do; but the intention is to say that even that might not suffice. The phrase should be "if even that would suffice."

(16) The impiety with which it (social reform) was regarded is slowly subsiding, giving place to a better understanding of things.

The sentence is all wrong. The writer cannot mean that social reform was regarded with impiety, nor that impiety is subsiding. No doubt what he does mean is that social reform was regarded as itself impious, but that that view of it was giving place to a better view.

(17) Preachers must be employed for persuading people to remove the obstacles to widow-marriage. People who have married widows are very likely to go about as preachers.

The latter of these two sentences is correct as it stands, but the context shows that it does not express what is intended. The writer must mean that men who have married widows are *likely persons* (*i.e.*, persons adapted by their status) to go about as preachers on this particular subject—not merely that they will probably do so.

(18) It is a stale promise held out by the British Government before many of us were born.

No doubt "before *most* of us were born" is intended.

"Before many of us were born" is ambiguous and does not necessarily mean a long period, because many of us were born quite recently.

(19) There was an opinion in some quarters that the disabilities of Christians had been falling short.

It would be difficult to interpret this sentence standing alone; but the context suggests that the opinion intended to be expressed was that the disabilities of Christians in the Maisur State had been unduly alleviated.

(20) The extremist bamboozles schoolboys into believing that only if they had an autonomous administration all the social evils would be remedied.

"Only if . . ." would take the inverted construction [see Section I., sub-head (*b*)] "would the social evils be remedied"; but the writer presumably means "if only . . ." The force of the two forms is not quite the same. "Only if I were well would I go" means: I would not go unless I were well. "If only I were well I would go" means: Given the one condition of being well, I would go.

(21) If they omitted religion from their daily life, as being an only suitable support for the old and a solace for the dying.

Presumably the writer means "as being a suitable support only for the old . . ."

(22) The people are sooner or later sure to find out who their real friends are, and who are not

"Find out who their real friends are" suggests the discovery of the status of persons already known as real friends; and such a clause cannot be appropriately coupled with "who are not." The order should be: "who are their real friends and who are not." In this order "who" becomes the subject of the verb "are," and "their real

friends" becomes the object. But in the order of the text the opposite is the case.

(23) Among those present were A, B, C, D, *and others.*

This is a common mistake with English as well as Indian reporters. It is obviously wrong to say that "others" were among those present—they were not *others;* they were some of those present.

(24) Speech-making is not the better part of political valour. It rather often defeats its own object.

Possibly the writer meant what he says, but it is far more likely that he meant to say "It often rather defeats . . ." or perhaps "Rather does it often defeat . . ."

(25) Morbidly conscious as he was of the sense of spiritual pollution, he fell so simply in acknowledging such folks as his kinsmen.

Perhaps to "fall" is used here in the sense of descending, or coming down from a high estate; but the verb would not be used thus by a native when the act of descent is deliberate.

(26) If these banks put out their hand further than they can reach.

The question being that of permitting Indian banks to borrow in London, the passage perhaps means "if these banks extend their operations to a point where they cannot exercise control"; but it is not clear.

(27) She was, however, miraculously saved by the best British medical aid that he was able to procure for her.

Here the relative clause "that he was able to procure" puts a limit on the word "best," and suggests that the best was not procurable. But no doubt what the writer means is that the best was procured and she was saved thereby.

To avoid ambiguity the whole form of the sentence would have to be altered. It might run: However he was able to procure the best British medical aid, whereby she was miraculously saved.

(28) He has been searching Krishna but could not find him anywhere.

"For" is here required after "searching." To search anybody means to examine his person to see what he has about him.

(29) The true man of the world, who is also a son of God, struggles unto blood against sin and ends his career with character.

The author of this example has written many beautiful passages, but is not readily intelligible here. I gather from the context that by "unto blood" he means at the risk or at the cost of his life, and by "ends his career with character" he means that the man by his life-long struggles fortifies his character, in contrast with the hermit who attains merely to innocence.

(30) The sublime goal where the cover of manifoldness disappears, leaving the one eternal Atma *severely alone*.

The expression to "leave severely alone" is often misused by native as well as by Indian writers. It is not equivalent merely to leaving *strictly* alone, but connotes some probable disappointment, on the part of the person left alone, at not receiving any kind of attention whatever.

(31) The Muhammadan papers often interest themselves about the condition of Muhammadans in Central Africa in a more marked degree than their Hindu brethren.

This expresses a meaning different to what must have been intended. The words "in that of" are required after "than."

(32) Our anxiety is that the system may be perpetuated.

The writer probably means that his anxiety is *lest* the system should be perpetuated. The sentence as written would rather mean the opposite, namely, that he was anxious that the system should be perpetuated.

(33) Graven *way* deep in their hearts is the sensation of fear of God.

The force of "way" is not apparent. Possibly "away" was intended, meaning "deep away in their hearts."

(34) In modern times Kavir may be cited as the best illustration of the illiterate Hindu Sufis.

Probably the writer means that Kavir may be cited as the best illustration in modern times etc.

(35) A language that mystified mysteries.

This is unintelligible—the reader may be mystified, but not the mystery.

(36) The greatest danger at present to the Hindu coparcenary, *possibly* its *certain* death in the near future, is the modern Hindu daughter-in-law.

"Possibly" and "certain" cannot stand together.

(37) There is only one college at Julfa, near Teheran, which cannot be said to compare with a first-class college in India.

The writer no doubt means that there is only one college *in Persia,* namely, the one at Julfa; and that that college cannot compare with a first-class college in India. But the text might be taken to mean that one only of the colleges at Julfa cannot compare etc., while all the others can.

(38) Our fear is not that Mr. Morison may go in the Muhammadan way, but that he may go in a way that may serve neither Muhammadan nor Hindu.

"Go in the Muhammadan way" is not good English. From

the context it would appear that the expression is used as equivalent to "act in a way favourable to the Muhammadans."

SECTION IV.—ERRORS IN PARTICULAR IDIOMS AND IN THE USE OF TITLES.

(1) Examining the arguments for and against widow marriage, we are convinced that its introduction is a *more* pressing necessity.

This use of the comparative to express a considerably high degree, without any actual comparison of two things one with the other, is an Indian, but not an English idiom. Yet, perhaps less logically, we do use the superlative (without the definite article) to express that sense. Thus "most" instead of "more" in the sentence above would have been grammatically allowable. Or if that word would have been too strong for the writer's purpose he might have said, "very pressing."

(2) The Social Conference aims at raising the status of Indians in general and does it *more* quietly.

There is in the context no comparison with the work of any other body. The "more" is therefore out of place. As in the last example, "most" or "very" should be substituted, according to the degree of intensity desired.

(3) If the forest laws are rigorous, the Government are charged with extreme parsimony; if the land tax is *heavier*, the blame again is on them.

This use of the comparative differs slightly from the last, but is equally open to objection. We could not well substitute "most heavy" here, but either "very heavy" or "too heavy" would do. There is not, as far as I know, any Indian word for "too" as distinguished from "very." The two words often bear the same meaning in English, namely,

excessively; but "too" has also a special sense, meaning more than enough, which "very" cannot express. A thing may be not *very* heavy, but still *too* heavy for the purpose in view.

(4) Our contemporary *of* the "Pioneer."

The "of" should be omitted. This is a mistake of daily occurrence. In fact, Indian editors are not strict enough in maintaining editorial impersonality. For example, an editor writes:—

(5) "We have followed the development of the scheme with close interest. *We* were present at the informal meeting . . ."

Here the first "we" is quite in order, but for the second one an English editor would say "the present writer." An analogous mistake is often made by magistrates in connection with the term "Court." It is correct enough to say "The Court acquits the accused person"; but it is not correct to say (as I remember once reading):—

(6) "As the Court was walking up the Jambusar road it saw the accused person's buffalo damaging a road-side tree."

An even more extreme case is cited of a magistrate writing about a prisoner "catching the Court by the leg" as it was getting into its carriage. But perhaps the most striking blunder ever made with regard to the editorial "we" was made by an Englishman and not an Indian. Some forty years ago there were two rival newspapers, the editors of which had both served as privates, the one in an infantry and the other in a cavalry regiment. The first of these one day rashly taunted the other with his former occupation, upon which the latter in his next issue retorted: "We at least had a horse to ride, while our contemporary had to trudge it on foot."

(7) It is none of his concern.

The idiom is "It is no concern of his."

"COURAGE OF CONVICTION."

(8) The leaders had *the courage of conviction* and carried out in practice what they preached on the platform.

This would mean that the leaders had the courage which arises from being convinced and not in doubt. But (as the following clause implies) what the writer really meant was that the leaders were as bold in action as they were in opinion. This may be expressed by the idiom "They had the courage of *their convictions*." But "courage of conviction" seems to have become an established expression with Indian writers, as the following examples indicate:—

(9) No man is more respected for honesty of purpose, *courage of conviction* . . .

Can a man be respected for courage of conviction? He has no choice as to his convictions. We indeed often speak of a man having the courage of his convictions. That means having the courage to go as far in conduct as his convictions tell him he should go. But "courage of conviction" hardly expresses that.

(10) Seth Raghunathdas Madhavdas showed great *courage of conviction* when he married a young widow.

(11) This cannot but result in the creation of a class of men who will exhibit courage of conviction, earnestness of purpose and faithfulness to duty.

"DARE SAY."

(12) There was not the slightest reason for dispersing the conference and I *dare say* it was a very great political blunder.

(13) We *dare say* the mere fact that somebody has lost heavily by the Arbuthnot failure does not entitle him to a share of the relief.

(14) I *dare say* the Dhed pupils bid fair to compete with the children of the upper classes.

In all these instances "dare say" is literally correct, but

the phrase has acquired an idiomatic meaning which is very different from its original sense; and therefore, when the latter sense has to be conveyed, English writers usually substitute the phrase "venture to say." No courage of assertion is now associated with "dare say," but rather an indifferent admission about equal to "probably" or even "possibly." Thus Canon Ainger writes :—

> "I think a little theology, and a little unction, improve a sermon. I *dare say* I am utterly wrong."

Of course he thought he was quite right—he only meant that possibly he might be quite wrong.

To "do."

The verb to "do" in one of its meanings is sometimes called a *substitute* verb, because it can be used in the second clause of a sentence as a substitute for the verb already expressed in the first clause. Thus repetition of the verb itself is avoided while repetition of the action is indicated.

But to "do" cannot be used in this way unless there *is* a preceding verb for it to represent, and moreover the active "do" can only represent a preceding active verb and not a passive one. Of these two sentences the first is right and the second is wrong :—

1. The king ordered them to put him to death and they did so.
2. The king ordered him to be put to death and they did so.

But Indian writers take this usage of to "do" beyond its proper limits and make it represent a substantive verb or even a noun. An extreme instance of this misuse is furnished by the schoolboy's famous essay: "The horse is a noble animal, but when irritated he does not always do so." Of

course accomplished writers do not make such blunders as this, but the following are actual mistakes :—

(15) They expected that what they treated as Hindu superstitions would be discarded, and some of the Hindus *did so* no doubt.

"Did so" raises the question "Did what?" and the only answer given by the preceding clause is "Did be discarded," which is nonsense. If the adverb "so" is joined to an active verb, the previous verb must be active too.

(16) Though the Buddhists were in the ascendant, the books of the Brahmans were also studied, as the traveller himself *did* during his stay at Nalanda.

Here also "did" can only represent "were studied," though the active "studied" is what is meant.

(17) A liberal infusion of the native element in the governing of a country is the most natural thing to *do*.

Here also "do" requires some antecedent verb the place of which it can take, but instead of any such verb there is only the phrase "a liberal infusion etc.," and we cannot say "to do a liberal infusion." If the sentence began "To *make* a liberal infusion . . ." it would be correct.

(18) It is not right that one should be visited with punishment for a deed he did not do. But society *does*.

This is similar. Society does what? The sentence supplies no answer. If it began "It is not right to *visit* . . ." then we should know what society does, namely it visits with punishment . . .

(19) The provisions of the Civil Marriage Act should be extended to the Hindu community, and a Hindu desirous of his marriage be permitted to *do so* without being forced to make a declaration that he has ceased to be Hindu.

Here again there is no antecedent verb for "do so" to refer back to. If instead of "desirous of his marriage"

the writer had said "*desiring* to marry," the sentence would have been correct.

(20) Their leaders are always enthusiastic for the Government as it pays them so well to *do so*.

This is similar. "Their leaders always *exhibit* enthusiasm" would permit the following "do so."

(21) The Government forced indigo planting, and those who *did* not or objected were punished.

"Did not" stands for "did not plant," but no verb to "plant" precedes.

(22) What is the *earthly* use of the Colonial office?

Here the adjective "earthly" is of course not used literally —to so use it would suggest that the Colonial Office might be of use in some other world—but expletively; and as an expletive it should not be preceded by the definite article. A native would say "Of what earthly use . . .?" or "What on earth is the use . . .?"

(23) Enough of arms in your country; seize them and drive the tyrants out of the soil of India.

The interjectional expression "enough of" has been misunderstood here. It is used to express that the speaker has had enough of the thing mentioned and wishes to pass on to something else, as, for example, "Enough of talk: let us now act." But in the text it is used in almost an opposite sense.

(24) A journalist who cannot reject a letter which he considers to be charged with personal malice *has got to learn* a good deal of his profession.

This should be "has a good deal of his profession to learn," meaning that there is a good deal that he is ignorant of. The expression "has got to learn" has a different effect,

meaning rather that the task of learning more has been set before him.

(25) In such an age when girls are looked upon as a burden . . . how can the sacrament theory hold *any* water?

The established expression is to "hold water."

(26) They *were in the idea* that they were everything there.

We should say "They had the idea etc."

"IT" AND "THERE."

(27) Is *it* something in the ruled or the ruler, to produce this beneficent fatalism?

The proper use of "it" and "there" in certain cases presents some difficulty. Of course, when "it" is used merely as the impersonal form of "he" or "him" the matter is simple. Nor do mistakes occur in the use of "it" with impersonal verbs like to "rain" where there is a kind of reflexive relation between the pronoun and verb, as in "It rains." But the difference between "It is," "it was," "it seems," etc. and "There is," "there was," "there seems," etc. is not always apprehended. Now in the text above either "it" should be changed to "there," or else the infinitive "to produce" should be changed to the clause "that produces." The distinction is this. "It" is a pronoun and can be used to represent a word or clause. "There" is an adverb and can represent nothing—it merely serves as the grammatical subject of a substantive verb, that is, a subject not possessing any meaning of its own but required only as a form to meet the exigencies of grammar. If we say "Is it something?" we must also indicate what the "it" stands for; if we say "Is there something?" we merely enquire as to the existence of something. "Is there peace?" is only a question as to the existence of peace.

But when Jehoram's horseman said to Jehu "Is it peace?" the real force of the question was "Is that which you intend peace?"

(28) Mrs. Besant applies the battery to the prostrate nervous system. For a time *it* is life, but the moment the battery is withdrawn, *there* goes back the organism to its chronic condition.

"It is life" raises the question "What is life?" and the sentence furnishes no answer. The "it" should be "there." The following "there" should be omitted and the clause run "the organism goes back etc."

(29) Nor could India, by any stretch of language, be said to have been held by one ruler as *it* is done now.

Does "it" refer to India? or is it part of the impersonal expression "It is done?" If the former, "done" should be omitted or changed to "held"; for India is held, it is not done. If the latter, it is out of place; for "as" (now a relative pronoun representing the act of holding) is the proper nominative to "is done." See the following examples.

(30) Otherwise, as *it* happens in the present case, the State becomes a tool in the hands of a creed for oppressing dissent.

Here "as" is a *conjunction*, and "it" is the nominative of the impersonal verb "happens"; but the proper idiom in such a case is to use the *relative pronoun* "as" (which then stands for the following clause "the state becomes . . ." and serves as the nominative of "happens"), and to omit the "it" for which there is no use.

(31) Mr. Lee tries to show that the cradle of the Semitic race is not in Western Asia, as *it* is generally believed, but in America.

This is similar to the last example except that the clause for which "as" should stand precedes it instead of following it.

(32) The imperative need of such a University as is proposed to establish at Aligarh.

Here on the contrary an "it" is required, because the relative pronoun "as" is the objective of the transitive verb "establish" and cannot therefore serve also as the nominative of "is proposed." So "it" is required as such nominative. "Such a University as is proposed for Aligarh" would do.

(33) The Linnean system of naming plants and animals is not difficult to adapt in Indian vernacular.

Similarly here "the Linnean system" is used both as the nominative of "is" and as the objective of "adapt." The sentence should be "*It* is not difficult to adapt . . ."

(34) Macaulay was of opinion that the right of self-defence should be allowed in a larger measure in this country than *it* is considered safe in England.

The "it" is thrown in here apparently just because "it is considered" is a familiar phrase. But its insertion has the effect of making the comparison to be between a *measure* (of length) and a *thought* (it is considered)—things incapable of comparison. Omitting the "it," the words "the measure which" will be understood after "than."

(35) The reform will be accomplished sooner than *it* seems at present possible.

The "it," whether it stand for "the reform" or whether it be part of the impersonal phrase "it seems," is out of place. We should say "sooner than seems at present possible," the words "the time which" being understood after "than."

(36) When it comes to the question of defence by constitutional means.

This should be either "When *we* come to the question . . ."

or "when it comes *to be* a question . . ." The latter form would be appropriate if the question were regarded as newly arising, the former if it had been contemplated before but not disposed of.

(37) Whether we do so or not *it* matters little.

The "it" serves no purpose here, because the clause "Whether we do so or not" is itself an adequate nominative to the verb "matters." It would be all right to say "It matters little whether we do so or not," because the material nominative being in reserve a representative one is needed to govern the verb. The material nominative then stands in apposition to the representative one. But when, as in the text, the real nominative has once been expressed, there is no occasion to introduce "it."

(38) The kind of taunt *which* Mr. Carlyle thought *it* fit to indulge in.

Either the "which" or the "it" should be omitted, as the verb cannot govern both. So in the following:—

(39) The vilification *which* Lord Curzon has thought *it* fit to deliver himself.

(40) That is the sort of help *which* these lip-patriots have thought *it* fit to give.

Just as Indian writers sometimes use the substitute verb to "do" to represent something other than an active verb, so they also occasionally use the pronoun "it" to represent something other than a noun or phrase. Thus we find

(41) It is mothers that mould a nation, but alas, we are lacking *it*.

It is necessary to express the thing that "it" stands for, such as "that influence" or "that advantage."

(42) We know better of their interests than they themselves do.

This should be "we know their interests better than they do

themselves." The writer has been misled through not distinguishing the three different expressions "To know of," "To know better," and "To think better of."

(43) A respectably connected Hindu girl in Bengal can hardly be married now without a dowry of two thousand rupees *in the least*.

The phrase "in the least" refers to degree of quantity, not degree of number. The phrase here should be "at least."

(44) All and every sign of greater wealth.

The idiom is "each and every," not as in the text.

(45) Dr. Ghosh may therefore have let well alone all malicious invective in the press.

There is confusion here between two distinct idioms. To "let well alone" means to abstain from trying to improve what is already passably good, lest you make it worse instead of better. To "let alone," by itself, means simply not to touch—to leave to itself. When the adverb "well" is put *before* a verb in such a phrase as "he might well retire," it means that the course mentioned would have been a proper one to take. Now, in the passage above the idiom, "let well alone" is quite out of place, because malicious invective cannot be regarded as a thing fairly good in itself. What the writer meant is clearly that Dr. Ghosh might (the "may" should be "might"—see page 113) well have let all malicious invective alone.

(46) Dr. Bhandarkar would have things called by their proper names, would not *mince* calling a spade a spade.

To "mince matters" is a particular idiom, and it does not do to use half of it without the other half. On the other hand, if "mince" is used in its literal sense, and without reference to the idiom, then "not mince calling a spade a spade" will

give a meaning the opposite of what is intended. It would mean, "He would not make little of calling a spade a spade" *i.e.*, he would be reluctant to call a spade a spade. The sentence might have run, "would have things called by their right names, would not mince matters, but would call a spade a spade."

(47) Why *need* he titles?

It is only before infinitives that the verb "need" drops its personal terminations—"he *need* not come," but "he *needs* money." See example (1), page 163.

(48) The mendicant who is moved to overwhelm you with blessings or with curses according as you throw or not throw a pice to him.

The auxiliary "do" is required with "not" to express the negative action of a verb in the present tense.

(49) So long as I have a brother, what do I care whether I have or not a son and heir?

The conjunction "or" must co-ordinate two things of similar grammatical status, as two nouns, two adjectives, two verbs, or two clauses. In the text it is put after the *verb* "have," and therefore another verb must follow to express the alternative—"whether I have or *have* not . . ." But if the "or" were put at the end of the *clause*, the negative "not" following it would suffice to express the whole alternative—"whether I have a son and heir or not." The word "not" (unlike the Indian negative) never possesses any verbal power of its own, but it can represent, while it negatives, a whole clause.

(50) Gentlemen who would never dream of *putting in their presence* if they were not innocent of the nature of the performance.

To "put in an appearance," though now commonly said

colloquially, is originally a technical legal expression, and it is not permissible to vary it by substituting "presence" for "appearance."

(51) It is not possible for us to do justice to all the speeches made, and we shall only *pass in rapid review of them* here.

This is perhaps not grammatically incorrect, but it is not idiomatic. The expression the writer had in mind was no doubt to "pass things in rapid review," that is to say the receiver passes the things before him—he does not pass in review of them.

(52) Men and women are prevented by their social system from developing, *as best they can*, those potentialities etc.

"As best they can" seems to be used here as equivalent to "in the best way"; but the phrase has acquired a particular sense, and usually involves the implication that the best is but bad. Thus one may say "You have got yourself into this difficulty, and now you must get out of it as best you can."

(53) We hope that Lord Minto will *rise equal* to the occasion.

This is at least an awkward expression—a man may "*rise* to an occasion," or, without rising, he may "*be equal* to an occasion"; but he can hardly "rise equal." There is nothing to express whether the equality is to be at the beginning or at the end of the rise. The writer has mixed the two idioms.

(54) My sudden appearance scattered the attendants to the right hand and to the left.

This is perfectly good English, but the native idiom is "right and left," and it is used as meaning not in *two* directions but in all directions. "To the right hand and to the left" is too precise to express the sudden effect.

(55) The Bombay temperance association is doing useful work, but it is a shame to admit that at least for a few years its preachers were paid by the late Mr. Caine and other Englishmen.

When we say that a thing "is a shame," we mean that it is itself disgraceful, a thing to be ashamed of. In this sense the word is often coupled with "sin," as "The shaving of widows is a sin and a shame." But in the text the word is used in its primary sense, namely a feeling of ignominy or distress at something one has done or suffered. The admission mentioned may occasion such feeling of shame, but it is not in itself *a* shame. "It is a matter of shame to admit . . ." would do.

(56) The girl calmly submitted to the operation with a determined will to *take* her life *off* at the earliest opportunity.

Here is confusion of two distinct idioms (1) to "take life," and (2) to "take off." The latter is used of the *person* taken off or killed, not of his *life*. Here "to take her life" would have been correct. To "take off" in the sense of to kill is not used reflexively.

(57) They will be ready to *pull* up their noses at the very mention of Government money.

The idiom is "*turn* up their noses."

(58) The prosecution of the "Panjabi" which dragged on *these months* ended in the conviction of the accused.

We do not use the phrase "these months" to express duration of time, though we can say "these three months," "these six months," etc., or "all these months"; and we can even use the term "months" by itself, as "This will last months." It may be worth while to notice that though the words "day" and "year" may both be used to denote general periods of time without reference to the specific limits

of a day or a year, "month" is never so used. We may say "All the days of my life," or "all the years of my life," but should not say "all the months of my life." So we say "in the days of Alexander," "stricken in years."

(59) For *these some months* we have been hearing of nothing but disturbances.

"These" and "some" cannot be used together—the one particularises while the other makes indefinite. "For some months" would be correct. Or, as said above, the pronoun "these" might be used with any *definite* number, as *two* months.

(60) The svadeshi movement is not new: it is old at least by thirty years.

The idiom is "thirty years old." If it were a case of comparison it would be right to use "by" after "older."

(61) It *was* almost half a century *ago* that the East India Company ceased to exist.

The idiom is to use the present tense with "ago" in such a sentence as this; because "ago" is a form of "agone" (which means gone by), and the half century is *now* agone.

(62) Unlike in industrial subjects, in questions of social reform what is most needed is enthusiasm.

This idiom is logical and is Indian, but it is not English. We should have to say "In questions of social reform, unlike industrial subjects etc."

(63) Unlike in India they had no caste system.

(64) Unlike in politics, where we have enlightened men to appeal to.

(65) The appointment comes to Mr. Davar unsought unlike in the case of some others.

In all these examples "unlike" is used as a conjunction, but it is never a conjunction. The positive "like" was

formerly so used, but is not allowable now. Its place is taken by "as." Of course "not as" may be substituted for "unlike," but it does not so strongly accentuate difference.

TITLES.

There are some idioms, in connection with the use of honorific titles, which are often misapprehended, and the following notes on this subject may be useful:—

The title "Sir" is used with Christian or personal names (or initials), not directly with surnames. It is correct to say Sir Subramania, or Sir Phirozshah, but incorrect to say Sir Aiyar or Sir Mehta.

As a substantive "Sir" was much used in Shakespere's time in the sense of "a person of rank," but it cannot be used as equivalent to "a person bearing the title of Sir" as below:—

(66) The mover being a Sir, and not a plain mister.

The title "Lord," when not indicating a baron or other peer but applied to a younger son of a duke or marquis, is used only with Christian names (or initials). It is incorrect to refer (as is often done) to one of the former Governors-General as "Lord Bentinck"—he was Lord William Bentinck.

So also the ecclesiastical title "Reverend" (usually contracted into "Rev.") is used only in the same way. We may say the "Rev. Charles Kingsley," or "Rev. C. Kingsley," but not the "Rev. Kingsley."

The use of the title "Honourable" when applied to the son of a peer is similar. When used as a mark of official,

as distinguished from personal, rank, it is followed by the title Mr. (a contraction of "mister," a form of "master") or whatever other title may be applicable.

I may here mention that the word "gentleman" is far more frequently used by Indians than by natives. It is of course generally used by members of the lower grades of society in England in speaking of those whom they regard as of higher grade; but amongst Englishmen of equal rank the term is mostly restricted to somewhat formal speech or ceremonial occasion. In a public meeting, for example, a speaker will refer to one of the audience only as a "gentleman"; but among intimate friends, or indeed among ordinary acquaintances, one man will refer to another only as a "man." But Indians as a rule have not adopted this habit, but continually say "gentleman" when we should say "man." Perhaps the most extreme instance of this usage that I ever heard was from the mouth of an Indian pleader who in arguing a case said: "Now suppose the property had come into the hands of a dishonest gentleman."

SECTION V.—OTHER ERRORS OF CONSTRUCTION.

Other cases remain in which the error does not lie in the order in which words are placed, nor in failure to convey the meaning intended, nor in the use of particular idioms (as considered in the previous sections of this chapter), nor in the wrong use of individual words or expressions (as will be considered in Chapter XII.), but in some general faultiness of construction as in the following examples. It will be observed that sentences in which terms of comparison are used are especially liable to errors of construction. These begin with example (12).

(1) Making women *absorb themselves* in mere trifles.

The verb "absorb" presents the figure of one thing drinking in another. We cannot therefore speak of women absorbing themselves in trifles—it is the trifles that absorb the women. "Be absorbed in trifles" would do.

(2) The great defect in our people is that of looking at things straight in the face.

"Defect" means the lack of something that is required—it does not mean that thing itself. The negative "not" should therefore be inserted before "looking." If the word "desideratum" had been used instead of "defect," no negative would have been required; but the following preposition would then have been "of" not "in," and some such word as "faculty" or "habit" would have been required in place of "that."

(3) Great as were his services to the Sadharan Brahma Samaj, correspondingly large is the gap caused by his death.

A sentence beginning in this form "Great as . . ." implies a coming contrast. For example, "Long as the time was, it was insufficient for the purpose," or "Attractive as the proposal is, it is not one that should be adopted." But in the passage cited there is no such contrast. It might have run thus: "His services etc. having been so great, the gap caused by his death is correspondingly large."

(4) All that they need is sufficient general education *as* to open their eyes.

The "as" should be omitted.

(5) The subject of education, important as it is, also attracted the attention of Lord Bentinck.

This form of construction is appropriate rather when the two clauses are *not* in logical harmony than when they are—

rather when the two predications create some surprise than when they express only what would be expected. It is not surprising that an important subject attracted the attention of Lord William Bentinck. Had education been an *unimportant* subject, the form of construction would have been proper. The writer ought to have begun "The important subject of education also . . ."

(6) He borrowed *as much* money *as to pay* his passage home.

In the correlation "as much . . . as" the first "as" is an adverb, and the second may be either a conjunction or a relative pronoun, according to the construction adopted. Here it is a relative pronoun and requires a predicative verb (not an infinitive) to follow it—"as much money as would pay . . ."

(7) Lord Curzon had *as much confidence* in his own ability to realise certain ideals *as he was convinced* of their adaptability to the East

With the correlation "as much . . . as," if the second "as" be used as a conjunction, the two expressions introduced must be of similar grammatical form, not one a noun and the other a verb, as above. Indeed the verb "had" which precedes the first "as" belongs equally to the second "as," and that produces an impossible form of sentence. Another way of putting the objection is that "much" with "confidence" is an adjective, but as understood with "convinced" it is an adverb; and it cannot be both at once. For "he was convinced" the noun "conviction" might be substituted.

(8) When we have done best what we now can do at all, it will be time enough to learn the doing of what we now cannot.

To have "done best" generally means to have done better

than all others, but here it is used for "in the best way." And "at all" seems to stand for "in some way or other." The verb requires to be repeated after the final auxiliary. See also the next example. But the sentence is beyond correction. We might say, "When we have learnt to do well what we now do indifferently, it will be time enough to learn to do other things which at present we cannot do."

(9) If sympathy were the keynote of the administration, the things that have taken place *would not have*.

An auxiliary verb should not be left in the air in this way; the principal verb should be repeated, as in the last example.

(10) It was suggested but not carried out that a system of taking finger impressions should be used.

What was not carried out? "It." But "it" does not stand for suggestion—it is only the nominative of the impersonal verb "was suggested." The noun "suggestion" requires to be expressed—"but the suggestion was not carried out."

(11) The article caused a certain afternoon deeply impressed on my memory, to re-appear with the keenest pleasure.

This attributes the feeling of pleasure to the afternoon subjectively, instead of to the person speaking. "The article caused me the keenest pleasure by recalling . . ." would do.

(12) We Indians have got many more things to learn than what we think we have already learned.

The sentence sounds very awkward. The fact is the writer is using terms of comparison when he has really no comparison to make. He does not mean that the things still to be learnt are *more in number* than those supposed to be already learnt. He means that *besides* the latter there are still many other things to be learnt. He should have said, "many things to learn besides (or beyond) . . ."

(13) It may be taken for granted that most of Mr. Dicey's allegations will be controverted by those who have known Lord Cromer's work more intimately than he could have observed from a distance.

The intended comparison is no doubt between two degrees of knowledge; but, as expressed, it is made between knowledge on the one hand and observation on the other.

(14) One should feel greater joy for what is in store for the movement than feel despondent for the little success yet achieved.

The mention of "greater joy" to be felt for one thing raises the expectation of the mention of another thing for which a less degree of joy is to be felt. But the comparison in the text is meant to be not between two degrees of joy, but between a feeling of joy and a feeling of despondency. The sentence might have run: "One should rather feel joy for . . . than feel despondent for . . . "

(15) Accustomed as they are to execute what they think or say, they translate their speeches or resolutions into practicalities much quicker than *they are done* at present.

What does the last "they" refer to? Apparently to "their speeches and resolutions." But it is not *their* speeches and resolutions, but speeches and resolutions *in general* that are meant. The last clause might be changed to "than is done at present." ["Practicalities" should rather be "practice."]

(16) The two parties cannot claim greater orthodoxy than one another.

The comparison is between the two parties, not between either party and orthodoxy. The sentence should run "One of the two parties cannot claim greater orthodoxy than the other."

(17) It has a great task of internal reform before it which we have as yet seen no serious attempt made to tackle.

Here the relative "which" is governed by the verb "tackle,"

but it is separated from it by several words, including two verbs, one of which suggests itself (until the whole sentence is realised) as possibly the one governing the relative. It would be better to say " to tackle which we have as yet seen no . . ."

(18) The complaint was due to the comparatively brighter prospects which other professions held out to them, and are still holding, than that of a teacher.

According to the structure of this sentence the comparison is between " prospects " and " profession." The words " those in " should be inserted after " than."

(19) He would have smaller but more numerous famine camps than big ones.

" Smaller . . . than big " is wrong. The " than " has nothing to do with the comparative " smaller." There is no predication that one thing is smaller than another, but a preference is expressed as between smaller and larger, just as a preference might be expressed between black and white without the use of any comparative at all. " Rather " should be inserted before the " than " to express the preference.

(20) The Edalji case has one lesson for us in India, and that is that after all, our executive are not often found so callous nor our courts of law so unsatisfactory as this case discloses in " free England."

What does this case disclose? Grammatically there is no answer, for the case discloses nothing as to " our executive," or " our courts of law," though the meaning is plain. " Discloses free England's to be " would do, but a complete resetting of the sentence would be better.

(21) He is no less an enterprising gentleman than Mr. Ramanathan.

The writer must mean either " He is no less a person than

the enterprising Mr. Ramanathan," or else "He is no less enterprising a gentleman than Mr. Ramanathan."

(22) Nothing is more difficult for one man than to understand the heart of another.

The error here is very slight and the meaning is clear and unmistakable as soon as the whole sentence is read. But the error is of a typical character and is moreover one very easy to avoid. So it is well worth notice. The words "Nothing is more difficult for one man" at once suggest to the mind that a comparison is about to be made between what one man may find difficult and what another may find difficult, as for instance it might be said "Nothing is more difficult for one man than to make a speech in public, while to another it is as easy as breathing." Of course as soon as the whole sentence is read the misconception is corrected, but it should never have been created, and could easily have been avoided by putting the words in their natural order—"Nothing is more difficult than for one man to understand the heart of another."

(23) What a pathetic picture the venerable little figure made as he stood up to restore order, ringing the bell with his frail right hand until it bent double under its weight!

Here we have four nouns, "figure," "order," "bell," and "hand," followed by "it" and "its"; and there is nothing in the structure of the sentence to tell us that the "it" refers to the first, and the "its" to the third of these nouns. No doubt many permissible sentences impose a certain amount of selection of this kind upon the reader—for example "He struck at him with his sword and wounded him." But in the text there is too much selection to be made.

(24) It was then that a subordinate judge, *hitherto* noted for a high sense of honesty and duty, *began* to think seriously of the turn events had taken.

"Hitherto" means up till now—the time of speaking—and cannot appropriately be followed by a verb which takes the time back to an earlier period. But the whole sentence is unhappily constructed, for the clause "hitherto noted etc." suggests some coming comparison or contrast, whereas the main clause "began to think seriously" is quite in accord with the previous representation. The sentence would be all right with the "hitherto" omitted. Supposing a contrast were intended between the two clauses, the "hitherto" should be replaced by "till that time."

(25) I want to impress upon you not to be satisfied with simply a theoretical belief.

"Impress" is a transitive verb and requires an object. The infinitive clause "not to be satisfied etc." cannot serve as such object; but such a clause as "that you should not be satisfied etc." would serve, some such noun as "the fact" being understood before it.

(26) He would seem to have been *too* generous *to a degree*.

"To a degree" in the sense of to a greater degree, exceedingly, is a colloquial expression, hardly to be used in serious composition. Nor in any case can it and the abverb "too" be both applied to the same adjective.

(27) No matter if the Shiahs lose a number of their creed, they will ensure the liberty and the long stay of the holy land of Karbala in the hands of their own king.

Here the verb "ensure" has two objects: (1) "the liberty," and (2) "the long stay." Then follow two attributive phrases "of the holy land of Karbala" and "in the hands of their own king." The first of these is meant to apply

to both the objects "liberty" and "long stay"; but the second is meant to apply only to "long stay." Yet the structure of the sentence takes no account of this difference, but treats both phrases alike. The following order would do: "they will ensure the liberty of the holy land of Karbala and *its* long stay in the hands of their own king."

(28) He would rather run away from the field and like to be branded as a coward than aid . . .

The verb to "like" by itself expresses no preference as between two things, but only a fondness for one thing: it therefore cannot be followed by the comparative conjunction "than" without the interposition of some such word as "rather." But as the sentence already has "would rather," which may combine with "be branded" as well as with "run," the words "like to" would be better omitted altogether.

(29) Do you look upon men as brethren, deserving a love that knows not death, you will then realise how unbrotherly is caste.

If this is all one sentence, we should have "If you look etc." instead of "Do you look etc." Or the sentence might be rhetorically broken into two—a distinct question, followed by an answer supplied by the questioner.

(30) I do not think that the "Commonwealth," in the sense we understand it to-day, and we *have had* undeniably since the days of Voltaire and Rousseau, was known either to Demosthenes or to Cato.

The "had" here is unintelligible; nor is "we have" sufficient to convey the sense "we have understood," because the word "understood" has not previously occurred, but only "understand," which is different. "Have understood it" must be expressed in full. For "it" in the text "the word" would be better.

(31) The wealth of material at his disposal has been devotedly sifted, carefully selected and expressively used.

Here there is one subject to the two verbs "sifted" and "selected," but one and the same thing cannot well be said to be both sifted and selected. The whole is sifted, and parts are selected.

(32) Care is taken that in the course of English study only the best and the most suitable are assimilated.

Some plural noun such as "thoughts," "ideas," or "principles" is required after "suitable."

(33) They are prevented from rising to their full stature of their manhood.

It should be "rising to *the* full stature of their manhood," or else "rising to their full stature" without the following words.

(34) As innocent a speaker as a bleating lamb.

An awkward expression because we should not ordinarily call a lamb a speaker. "Speaking as innocently as a lamb bleats" would express what is meant.

(35) Physical development is also more natural than creditable to any intelligent care.

Even if "creditable" can be used in this sense at all, the sentence is not one which expresses its meaning very readily. According to mere form the phrase "to any intelligent care" might refer to "natural" as well as to "creditable," and such perplexity should be avoided. The sentence might have run: "Physical development is rather a natural process than due to any intelligent care."

(36) That they should employ all their powers of reasoning in support of the *statu quo* is only to be expected.

The form *statu* is the ablative case, as used in the familiar expression *in statu quo*, the preposition *in* requiring the

ablative. In the passage above the primary form *status* should have been used.

(37) To Lord Dalhousie India is indebted for many things, barring annexation, which we pass over in silence.

This use of the verb to "bar" implies that the thing barred is excluded by the writer from a certain category (of the rest of which he makes a new predication). But in order to be so excluded it must first belong to that category. Therefore the text implies that annexation is one of the things for which India is indebted to Lord Dalhousie. But that is not what the writer means. He might have said "Among Lord Dalhousie's actions, barring annexation, are many things for which India is indebted to him"; for then "annexation" is excluded only from the general category of Lord Dalhousie's actions, and not from the category of those commended.

(38) Every attempt made by the two communities to create separate schools and interests among themselves *and not to heal up* the wounds inflicted by mutual hatred of caste and creed must be deprecated on all hands.

The structure of the sentence involves the expression "attempt not to heal up etc.," and it is difficult to conceive what an attempt not to heal up may be. "Instead of trying to heal up etc." would be the natural idiom.

(39) The doctor disabuses the notion that over-reaching each other is the main business of lawyers.

To "disabuse" means to free the mind from some misapprehension, and therefore requires a personal object followed by "of" before the matter misapprehended.

(40) It is heartily *desired* by the Indian nation *that it is high time* that the unpopular tax be now repealed.

The "desire" is of course meant to relate to the "repeal"

not to the "high time," the latter being a matter of opinion (omitted from the sentence), not of desire.

(41) The retraction and repudiation will not be deemed *worth while to be republished.*

We say it is not worth while *to do* a thing, but we cannot say that a thing is not worth while *to be done.* It is the person not the thing that feels the waste of time. It would be correct to say that the repudiation was not deemed *worthy* of being republished.

(42) But in the long run, as in everything else, character tells.

Here the two phrases "in the long run" and "in everything else" appear to be compared. Some such phrase as "in this matter" should be inserted between them. Even then it would be better to transpose "in the long run" to the end of the sentence, so as to break the collocation of prepositional phrases.

(43) Nothing so much surprised them as the spectacle of Moslem families, sticking to their national costume and manners, whose educated daughters moved about with perfect ease, and uneclipsed by the pardah.

The spectacle which caused surprise was not that of Moslem families sticking to their national costume, but was that of their educated daughters moving about etc. The participial form should therefore have been employed rather for the verb "move" than the verb "stick." The separation of the relative "whose" from its antecedent "families" is also awkward, especially as another noun comes in just before the relative. A better construction would have been "the spectacle of the educated daughters of families, who still stuck to their national costume, moving about etc."

(44) Education is impossible to impart to them at that tender age.

"Impart" requires an object. We might say "It is impossible to impart education etc."; or "Education cannot be imparted etc."

(45) Each and every one of these superstitions and castes would fill volumes to describe in detail.

It is not the superstitions and castes but the descriptions of them that would fill volumes. It would be better to use the impersonal form "It would fill volumes to describe . . ."

(46) Attention must be next drawn to reform the law.

Here "to" seems to be part of the infinitive "to reform"; but "to" is also wanted before the object to which attention is to be drawn. "Drawn to the necessity of reforming the law" would do.

(47) Great is the value of obedience, but here it is not always regarded as a great virtue, and sometimes sought to be discarded.

The "is" before "regarded," being made negative, requires to be repeated (without the negative) before the other verb "sought," if the latter is not intended to be negative also.

(48) We must do so in a loyal spirit, and that not to thwart them, but to help them in carrying on the administration.

The sentence would be better without the words "and that."

(49) We congratulate the Vikrampur schoolmaster and his progressive castemen on the happy example they have set, and wish that it *is* followed largely.

For "is" we should have "may be"—an actual fact cannot be the object of a wish.

(50) The occasion demanded that something more than these sentiments *were* given.

For "were" we should have "should be," the predication being not of a fact but of the object of a demand.

(51) The Government are naturally anxious that the benefit *is* widespread, and *reaches* those for whom it is intended.

"*Should be* widespread" and "*should reach*" are required, the predications being not of actual fact but of the objects of a wish.

(52) The Begam is one of the most enlightened of our native rulers, and we wish her example *was* largely followed.

Instead of the indicative "was" we should have the subjunctive "were."

(53) As far as the way in which these proceedings were gone through, it may be said the conferences held at Coconada were a thorough success.

"The way" expresses a method, not a limit; so some such expression as "was concerned" is required after the word "through."

(54) If there is to be any difference, the people of the country should have a preferential claim, and Europeans *are to be* appointed only in case of necessity.

For "are to be" we should have "should be," as the writer is not stating what is to be but what he thinks should be. See also examples (42) and (43), page 111.

(55) At whose feet powerful magnates sat, received and obeyed commands.

The conjunction "and" joins the two verbs "received" and "obeyed," and has the effect of making "commands" the object of both of them. But the structure of the sentence includes also the intransitive verb "sat" in the same way;

because it is usual, when three things are mentioned together, to insert "and" only after the second. The text requires another "and" after "sat" because it and the two transitive verbs which follow are not on the same footing.

(56) He considered a separate political organisation for the Muhammadans was unnecessary, much less was required an organisation that would oppose other political bodies.

There is here no grammatical connection between the two clauses of the sentence; each is of independent form, and they are merely separated by a comma. Again, the form of the second clause is awkward, because "much less" suggests itself, at first, as the subject of the verb "was required." The comma might be replaced by a dash, and the "was required" omitted. Or, if it were desired to retain this verb, the "required" should have been put after "organisation." That is the proper order of inversion.—See Section I., subhead (*b*) of this chapter.

(57) *There are not indications wanting* that our public life and our public work have reached a critical condition.

The writer means that there *are* indications of the kind in question, and so it is awkward to begin the sentence with the words, "There are *not* indications." The proper form would be "Indications are not wanting that etc.," for the "not" should come next the "wanting," to which it belongs.

(58) Hinting *him of* my vague suspicions.

With to "hint," the thing expressed is made the direct object. The text should be "Hinting my vague suspicions to him."

(59) As almost all the girls' schools do not levy . . .

We should rather say, "As very few (or hardly any) of the

girls' schools levy . . ." The affirmative is better than the negative form when the negation is not complete.

(60) We have not had a good history of our country for the past many hundreds of years.

"Past" is quite redundant here, nor can it be thus used to qualify an expression like "Many hundreds of years." If used at all it should be put immediately after the word "years," which is the word it really qualifies. The definite article is quite out of place here.

(61) Who can *deny* that if there were aught in Hindi and Urdu education, humanitarian instincts would *not* have prevailed long ago.

This doubling of the negative is allowable in the Indian vernaculars; but in English either the "not" should be omitted, or a positive verb like "say" substituted for "deny."

(62) It cannot be said that there have been no Indian Christians whose piety and learning did *not* entitle them to a bishopric.

Here, also, the double negative is wrong in English, though allowable in the Indian vernaculars.

(63) Indian ladies are not willing to raise themselves to that standard by which we view our English sisters.

Here we have *to* a standard and *by* a standard: that is, the word standard is used in two different senses—(1) that of grade or level, and (2) that of an instrument of comparison.

(64) The Calcutta Congress was the largest political gathering since its birth.

This sentence at once strikes the English ear as wrong, the fact being that the word "congress," though expressed only once, is used in two different senses. When reference is made to its birth, "Congress" means the institution which

survives from year to year; but when it is said that the Calcutta congress was the largest political gathering, the word refers to a particular meeting. "Since the birth of the institution" would do.

(65) The diminution of number menaces still further to go down.

To "menace" (unlike to "threaten") is never used with a following infinitive. A diminution (of number) going down would imply that the number went up. What the writer means is that "the number threatens to go down still further."

(66) A strong opinion is prevailing here *for requesting* Mr. Tilak to accept the presidentship.

This could be either "in favour of Mr. Tilak's being requested," or "that Mr. Tilak should be requested." We cannot say an opinion *for* a thing.

(67) We find him working early and late to provide means for these objects in view.

The objects being indicated by the pronoun "these," the additional attributive "in view" comes in awkwardly. We should say either "these objects" only, or else "*the* objects in view."

(68) It was resolved to submit a memorial to Government, *asking for legalising* certain marriage reforms.

This use in close proximity of two present participles, each referring to a different actor, is very awkward. Indeed, the use of the second one is a grammatical error, for there is nothing to indicate what the subject of the action is. It should be changed into a gerund or substantive, as "the legalising of," or "the legislation of."

(69) The modifications conceded to by the authorities at Downing Street.

The modifications are *conceded,* not *conceded to.* The preposition might be used before the persons to whom they are made.

(70) He has seen the native potentates from India—rulers *to whom* he thought they made a mistake in not attaching the weight due *to them* as standing forces in India.

This is an intolerable sentence. In the first place the term "weight due" cannot support both the "to whom" and the "to them"; and secondly, the "to whom" is too far separated from the "weight due" for the latter to support it. The sentence might run: "and he thought a mistake was made in not attaching due weight to them as standing forces in India."

(71) One fact is laid stress upon.

What is laid is the *stress,* and not the *fact.* So the sentence reads awkwardly. The use of the passive voice in English requires much care. See the following examples:—

(72) The conference was *resolved to be held* on the 5 June.

The conference was not resolved, for it had not even met. It was the persons present who were resolved to hold it.

(73) The home had been *decided to be erected* in Madras.

Rather, "It had been decided to erect . . . ," or "It had been decided that the home should be erected . . ."

(74) Outram was thrice *attempted to be killed* at the Gaekwar's court.

Better, "Three attempts had been made to kill . . ."

(75) The partition of Bengal is *sought to be retaliated* by the boycott of English goods.

Better, "Retaliation for the partition of Bengal is sought . . ."

(76) Many an enquiring and earnest mind, when *on half way such a task, feel* hopeless and *turn* back despairing.

"On half way such a task" is not allowable—there is nothing to govern the phrase, "Such a task." "When half way through such a task" would do. The expression, "Many a," though plural in effect, is finally singular in form, and requires the verb to be in the singular.

(77) A hundred or two thousand Europeans.

This might mean "100 or 2,000 Europeans," but the writer means "One or two hundred thousand."

(78) Their destiny is in their own hands and not in the hands of *those* handful of people who lord over them.

"Handful" being singular in form, though expressive of a number, requires its adjective to be singular also. The more usual expression is "lord *it* over."

It is a not uncommon error, and, at least in speech, with natives as well as Indians, to put a verb in the plural because a plural noun immediately precedes it, though the real subject is singular. Thus we have

(79) The social *life* of great nations *have* mainly been shaped by political forces.

(80) It is curious to note how widespread the *use* of some of these symbols *are*.

(81) It is no small pride for members of the English bar that some of the most renowned professors of law have been they.

There are three logical errors here—(1) the thing meant to be predicated is not pride itself, but a *matter of pride,* that is, a matter to give rise to pride; (2) pride being an inward feeling, the preposition should be "to" rather than "for"; (3) "they" here standing for the English bar, it is wrong to say that the prosperous are "they," because the prosperous are only a very few of them. The sentence might

run : " It is a matter of no small pride to the members of the English bar that some of the most renowned professors of law have belonged to their body."

(82) We would invite attention to the judgment in the case brought against a gentleman who married a widowed girl and two others, by her father, of kidnapping.

The writer of this passage could hardly have felt quite satisfied with it. The amount of matter is, in fact, too much for a single sentence. It might have been expressed thus : "We would invite attention to the judgment in the case of the kidnapping and marriage of a widowed girl. The case was brought by the father of the girl against three persons—the one who had married her, and his two accomplices."

(83) The banner of truth and devotion, which the Gurus had raised and poured their life blood to sanctify its glory, drew disciples.

A relative clause must not be allowed to jump out of its relative form in this way. " The Gurus " is the nominative of both " raised " and " poured," and the whole clause must bear back on the " which." There is no objection to " poured " taking an independent object, as it does, but then the following verb " sanctify " ought to take the " which " as its object. But it also is given a new object, " its glory," so that all the latter part of the clause breaks away from the " which." The sentence would be correct with " its glory " omitted. Or it might run : " And to sanctify the glory of which they had poured their life blood."

(84) What Professor Armstrong made so plain in his speech, but was to us then in a nebulous form, served as our starting point.

The pronoun " what " is here the objective of the first verb " made," but the nominative of the second verb " was "—

that is, it stands in two cases at once, which is impossible. A new relative "which" is required before "was."

(85) It was no evidence against the other accused, three of whom being acquitted.

The relative expression, "three of whom," requires a verb, and cannot be used absolutely with a participle, as in the text. "Three of *them*" might be so used. Or "three of whom were acquitted" would do.

(86) The same terms and facilities offered to the Kathis were finally accepted by the Muhammadans.

Here "same" and "offered to the Kathis" are not two independent attributives to the subject "terms and facilities," but a predication is intended that the terms accepted by the Muhammadans *were* the same as those offered to the Kathis. That being so, the words, "as were" are required before "offered." Or the point may be stated thus: When the quality referred to by the word "same" has already been expressed, the word may be used as a simple adjective, but when that quality has still to be expressed, the correlation "same . . . as" must be used to express it.

(87) What sort of Muslims are they at Barisal *as* to be provoked into breaking the peace?

The idiom is "sort . . . to be," not "sort . . . *as* to be," because "sort" is a substantive. The adjective "such" would be rightly followed by "as."

(88) The best interests of the schoolboys were always at his heart.

We say "at heart" not "at his heart"; so the sentence should be turned thus: "He had always at heart etc."

(89) The result is that the produce of articles of food is constantly verging on famine prices.

The meaning is apparently that produce consisting of articles

of food is etc. The words "the produce of" might be omitted altogether, and the verb changed to the plural.

(90) We are not sure if our energies are not misdirected; *if* we have not been *aiming at the final, first; if* we are deserving that which we desire *for.*

Here the second clause is too much in the style of a *sutra* for the English language, and requires expansion. The whole sentence might run: "We are not sure that our energies are not misdirected; that we have not been trying to obtain at first what we are only entitled to obtain at last; that we deserve what we desire."

(91) Imported articles which can either easily be dispensed with, or substituted by indigenous articles.

"Substituted by indigenous articles" is wrong, because indigenous articles are themselves the things to be substituted. The second clause should be: "or for which indigenous articles can be substituted."

(92) But what will the Hindu women be or are but "household stuffs etc."?

We require to say "or what are they" instead of only "or are." Otherwise the placing of the auxiliary "will" before the noun has the effect of applying it to the second verb ("are") as well as to the first ("be").

(93) The case presents a most distressing situation both for the landlord as well as the tenant.

Either "both" should be omitted, or "and" should be substituted for "as well as." So also in the next:—

(94) Both men as well as women in Hindu society have useful missions to fulfil.

(95) There is no reason why Hindus and Muhammadans should not sink their old tradition of antagonism, when they now sail in the same boat.

"When they now sail" should be "now that they sail," or "when they sail, as they do now, in the same boat." Observe "when they sail" is a contingent clause, and if it be intended to affirm that the contingency has already become actual, a distinct predication to that effect is necessary.

(96) I want that you should follow me in the worship of the common Mother.

(97) If we want that Indian capital should be diverted etc.

(98) Another wanted that the village astrologer should be invested.

(99) He wants that practical agriculturists should be appointed.

The verb to "want," when used in this sense, should be followed by the infinitive. If "wish" or "desire" were substituted for "want," either the clauses in the text would do, or the infinitive might be used.

CHAPTER XI.

METAPHORS.

INDIAN writers are fond of metaphors and make free use of English ones. For instance, though Hindus do not bury their dead, a Hindu writer will readily speak of one of his own countrymen "having one foot in the grave." And though an Indian cooking-fire is usually in a small enclosed space completely covered by the vessel in use (so that nothing can fall from it into the fire beneath), he will readily use the expression "out of the frying-pan into the fire." He is not, however, always sufficiently careful to keep the figure of speech to its proper form, but will sometimes bend it to unnatural uses, as some of the following examples show :—

"BOIL DOWN."

(1) The district officer's work might be lightened by judicious *boiling down* of reports and returns.

As the district officer is regarded as the author of the reports and returns in question the metaphor is not here appropriate; for in order to reduce by boiling down the larger bulk must first exist.

"BOTH ENDS MEET."

(2) The skilled artisan can hardly make two ends meet.

This should be "make both ends meet." There are only two ends in question, the means and the maintenance, or the income and the outlay.

"BRUSH UP."

(3) We should *brush up our eyes*, and look at the gulf yawning before us.

To "brush up" belongs primarily to things physical, and

thence it is used as a metaphor in respect of other things such as knowledge or memory. But it is very awkward to apply it as a metaphor to anything physical, because the physical object at once attracts the literal meaning of the word "brush," and the picture thus formed is an absurd one.

"CLIP WINGS."

(4) A repressive policy which may *clip the wings* of the *unfettered* privilege of free speech.

This mixture of metaphors is unpleasing, as we do not naturally associate fetters with wings. Much worse mixtures are however not uncommon with English speakers, as, for instance, the mention made some time back in the House of Commons of some one being "too old a bird to rise to the bait." And the writer of the text above might plead Shelley's :—

"Bird of the wilderness,
Blithesome and cumberless."

But "unfettered" is more closely figurative than "cumberless."

"CUT AND DRIED."

(5) Everything has to be done according to certain *cut and dry* rules.

The proper expression is "cut and dried," the reference being to timber that after being cut is dried and so seasoned for use. This reference was for a time lost sight of, and "cut and dry" became the popular form of the expression, and it was so used by Swift. But usage has since corrected it. A similar instance of error and correction is furnished by the word "brand-new," which fifty years ago was spelt and pronounced "bran-new."

"EYE TO EYE."

The expression to "see eye to eye" with another person as now used in English is itself a perversion of a Hebrew idiom which was used of two persons seeing one another eye to eye, or, as we now say, face to face. But the modern idiom is used of two persons who take the same view of any matter. In example (6) below the meaning of the idiom has been apprehended, but the phraseology is wrong. In example (7) "eye to eye" seems to be used in the sense of fully or accurately.

(6) The Aga Khan does not see the Congress school *eye to eye* in regard to the defence of the country.

The idiom is does not "see eye to eye with" the Congress school, meaning that the two points of view are not quite the same.

(7) The sun-dried bureaucrat, who has not been able to see *eye to eye* the ambition of young India . . .

Here the idiom has been misunderstood, the eye of only one person being referred to. The idiom can only be used of *two* persons who take the same point of view of any matter; or, negatively, who do not take the same view.

"FOOTPRINTS ON THE SANDS OF TIME."

(8) His successor will *deepen the footprints* which Lord Curzon has had time enough *lightly to trace* on the sands.

To speak of footprints on the sands of time is a fair metaphor, but who is ever concerned to *deepen* footprints? And again the *tracing* of footprints is the function rather of a tracker than of the original pedestrian. And the adverb "lightly" fits neither the one nor the other, but rather the work of a draughtsman.

"RUN THE GAUNTLET" AND "THROW DOWN THE GAUNTLET."

(9) As I have already *run the gauntlet*, I must try my best to put before you what my own particular views are.

As the speaker was referring only to the fact of his having accepted the office of president of a conference, it would seem that what he meant to say was that he had *taken up* the gauntlet. The two metaphors are entirely distinct—indeed, the word "gauntlet" in the one is altogether a different word to the "gauntlet" in the other: the one is of French origin and means a glove; the other is Scandinavian and means literally "lane-running." The latter word (from *gata*, a lane, and *lopp*, running) became the name of a particular form of punishment, which consisted in making the offender run through a lane formed of two rows of men armed with switches or knotted cords, who struck him as he ran. To "run the gauntlet" means to undergo this punishment, or, figuratively, to sustain a series of blows or attacks from different quarters. To "take up the gauntlet" means to pick up a glove thrown down as a challenge, and thence, generally, to accept a challenge.

"AGAINST THE GRAIN."

(10) Strong persistent agitation we know not. It is against *our* grain.

(11) Mr. Morley has to countenance a policy which goes against *his* grain.

(12) It should have gone rather against *their* grain to have to welcome effusively representatives of a race which was legally prevented from landing.

The metaphor "against the grain," which is taken from the cutting of wood, can of course be applied to persons; but the individual word "grain" cannot be so applied, for it remains the grain of wood. The article "the" should

in each case be substituted for the pronoun. And in the first "goes" would be better than "is," as the opposition of the grain is not felt until movement against it is attempted.

"HAND IN HAND" AND "HAND TO HAND."

(13) The rich and the poor, the lord and the peasant, fought *hand in hand* for the defence of their constitution.

This figure of speech is not suitable in this connection, as holding hands would interfere so much with effective fighting. The phrase "hand *to* hand" is used of two persons fighting in close combat the one *against* the other.

"KNOCK THE BOTTOM OUT."

(14) Remorselessly knocking the bottoms *off* what appeared to be sound arguments.

We speak of knocking bottoms "out" not "off"—the metaphor being probably taken from the figure of a wooden barrel the bottom of which is slightly within the cylinder.

"LEVER."

(15) Success would result in a great *leverage* for *scaling* the higher altitudes of public life.

Two distinct figures of speech, such as climbing a height and moving a mass by means of a lever, should not be mixed together.

"LICK INTO SHAPE."

(16) Legislation is *licked into* all manner of *shapes* to suit provincial and social requirements.

The phrase "lick into shape" cannot well be used of an abstract noun like legislation," and the metaphor is destroyed by the use of the plural "shapes." It is derived from the notion that a bear cub is without shape when born, and is licked by its mother into shape. Thus in Hudibras:—

'A bear's a savage beast, of all
Most ugly and unnatural;
Whelp'd without form, until the dam
Has licked it into shape and frame."

The expression might be used of any particular proposed enactment, though not of legislation in general which takes shape in many different laws.

"LEAVE IN THE LURCH."

(17) Are they so far dissociated from each other that you can pursue the ideal political leaving the social and religious *in the lurch*.

The metaphor "in the lurch" carries with it some sense of unfair treatment, or of some advantage taken, whereas here nothing seems to be contemplated but the pursuit of one ideal to the neglect of another. Here is an example of the proper use of the idiom :—

"My master carries me to church,
And often am I blamed,
Because I leave him in the lurch
As soon as text is named."

The meaning is that, unknown to his master, the boy sneaks out of church after first hearing the text given out, so that he may use it as evidence that he was present during sermon time.

"NEW WINE IN OLD BOTTLES."

(18) It is of course difficult for a Convocation orator to say anything new or original. . . . He must be merely content to pour, as it were, old wine in new bottles.

This is not a proper use of the metaphor. The figure refers to the folly of putting new wine into old bottles (*i.e.*, wine-skins); because the old skin having lost its elasticity would

be unable to yield to the fermentation of the new wine, and so would burst. But to speak, as in the text, of putting old wine into new bottles is without any figurative force. [As to the position of "merely" see page , and as to "in" for "into," page 66.]

"NICHE."

(19) If India is ever to win for herself a *niche in the comity* of nations.

A foreigner is hardly open to criticism for thus using the word "comity," as many English writers of repute have made the same mistake. Mistake however it is, for "comity" is derived from the Latin adjective *comis*, courteous, and has no connection with the noun *comes* (genitive, *comitis*), a companion. But the figurative word "niche" cannot be appropriately used with "comity" in any sense; for "niche," to complete the figure, requires the association of some word suggestive of a building of some kind. I have, however, known an English author write of "a niche in the field of literature"; but the example is not one to be followed.

"PRINTER'S DEVIL."

(20) The substitution of Ajit Singh for Lajpat Rai may be a *Reuter's devil*.

Boys in printing presses came to be called printer's devils because they got so blackened with the ink. It may be allowable to extend the term to a telegraph office though no printer's ink is used there. But it is wrong to apply the term to a *mistake* instead of to the *person* who makes it.

"RINGING THE BELLS."

(21) There are few who can resist the temptation of winning

popular applause and playing to the gallery by *ringing the bell of the hour.*

The ringing of bells (*i.e.*, of a *peal* of bells) is a recognised expression of rejoicing, but the metaphor in the text is not an English one.

"THE ROD."

(22) The paternal Government as well as the paterfamilias should wield its authority so as to control the child, without breaking *the rod that holds him in check.*

There is misapprehension of an English metaphor here. When we speak of using a rod to check a child, it is not a connecting rod used to guide, but the rod of chastisement that is in view. Possibly the writer was misled by Wordsworth's lines :—

"A light to guide, a rod
To check the erring, and reprove."

"SHAKE IN ONE'S SHOES."

(23) We can by sheer force of numbers make the whole world *tremble under our shoes.*

This sounds very quaint to the English ear. There seems to be some confusion between the popular expression "to shake in one's shoes" and the metaphor "to have under one's foot," with possibly some sense of the Indian habit of using the shoe as an instrument of chastisement.

"PUT ONE'S SHOULDER TO THE WHEEL."

(24) We should put our united shoulders to the wheel, to drag the car of progress to its destination. The car is a heavy one, and those who care to join in carrying it must be men of strong convictions . . .

The picture of 260,000,000 united shoulders being put to the wheel, or even to all the wheels of a car, is something

of a strain on the metaphor. And again in using the word "carrying" in the second instance the figure of the wheel seems to be lost sight of.

"SIFT."

(25) The committee will *sift* all the *aspects* of the military policy.

To "sift," which is connected with the word "sieve," may be used figuratively of *facts*, *arguments*, etc., but hardly of *aspects*.

"SOURCE."

(26) Information obtained from a reliable and *well-informed source*.

The term "source" may perhaps be applied to a *person*, but it still remains a figure meaning the rising as of a spring or river; and as such it is not fitting to speak of it as being "well-informed."

"SET THE THAMES ON FIRE."

(27) He will never set the Hughli on fire.

This is a natural adaptation of the English phrase "Set the Thames on fire." The adaptation, however, becomes rather quaint if, as some authorities assert, "Thames" is a corruption of "temse," a corn sieve, and the phrase was used to denote such a degree of energy and such rapidity of action as would cause the sieve to ignite through friction.

"THIN END OF THE WEDGE."

(28) This is probably a thin end of the wedge.

This is not a correct use of the metaphor, as a wedge has only one thin end.

"THREAD" AND "REINS."

(29) The interference of the supreme government in matters of detail ought to be reduced to a minimum, but the *threads* of policy must naturally rest largely in its *hands*.

There is confusion of two distinct metaphors here—(1) that of a thread which runs through and connects the different parts of something, and (2) that of the control of horses by reins held in the hands. But there is no figurative force in speaking of threads resting in the hands.

"TIDE."

(30) The Nasik people *took the sea by its tide* when they . . .

"Took the sea at its tide" might possibly do, but the more natural metaphor would be "took the tide at its flood."

CHAPTER XII.

VOCABULARY.

SECTION I. WORDS WRONGLY USED.

(1) He was a staunch *adherent* of a constitution in the Congress.

He could not be an adherent, as the contemplated constitution is not yet established. "Adherent to the cause of . . ." would do. Or "advocate" might be substituted.

(2) We suppose that the Hindus of East Bengal are entitled to be *administered* according to the law.

We do not use the verb "administer" with a personal object. The sentence might run, "Entitled to have this province administered etc."

(3) The raja of Pithapur *advised* that those books need not be taught in the high school at Pithapur.

To "advise," in the sense intended, is a transitive verb, and requires an object. "Intimated" would do.

(4) The ordinance does not professedly *aim* at the spread of sedition only: it aims also at the preservation of the peace.

The verb "aim" is rightly used in the second clause, but not so in the first. In connection with this verb, the ordinance may be figured either as the archer or as the arrow. As the former, it *aims* at what it wants to secure—the preservation of peace; as the latter, it *is aimed* at what is regarded as hostile—the spread of sedition.

(5) The progress of a nation is not like the progress made in writing a dictionary, where you begin with the succeeding *alphabet* after the previous one has been completed.

For "alphabet" we should have "letter," the former word meaning the whole series of the letters of a language.

(6) The inducement to illicit production will be *appreciably minimised.*

The word "appreciably," which is expressive of degree, cannot aptly be used with the verb "minimise," which expresses extremity.

(7) Has the goal been reached or *approximated?*

A goal cannot be approximated, because it is fixed. The word should be "approached."

(8) Foreign travel against which fanaticism was *arranging* itself till very *late.*

"Arranging" is apparently a mistake for "ranging," and "late" for "lately." "Till very late" means till a very late date in respect of the action in question. "Till very lately," means till recently.

(9) When materials for starting a new industry are *assembled.*

"Assemble" is used of persons or quasi-persons, not of inanimate things such as material. We should say "collected."

(10) The chief difficulty is in getting a cheap *assembly* of the materials required for the manufacture of iron.

"Assembly" is not now used of inanimate objects (though "assemblage" occasionally is); "collection" would be the proper word.

(11) Though prayers were embodied in the address no method or means were settled to secure their *attainment.*

"Attainment" would apply to the object of prayers, not to the prayers themselves. The sentence might end, "to secure assent to them."

(12) The want of fixed institutions makes it impossible for a native Prince to calculate that he will *bear* his power to an efficient successor.

We can speak of bearing a material thing to a person,

in the sense of conveying it to him; we can also speak of bearing power, in the sense of possessing or exercising it; but we cannot combine the two meanings in one use of the word. Instead of "bear" in the text, "pass on" or "make over" would do.

(13) I bear God my witness that I have never seen etc.

In the expression to "bear witness" the noun means evidence or testimony, not a witness in person. In the text instead of "bear," either "make" would do, or "call" or "cite" with "as" after the object.

(14) It has *become* to be recognised amongst us that *the* boys should not be married earlier than 20.

We should say "It has come to be recognised" or "It has become a recognised fact." [The definite article is out of place before "boys." See Chapter II., Section I.]

(15) Real political progress consists in *befitting* the nation to take up those duties.

To "befit" does not mean to render fit—it means to become, to be suitable to. "Training" or "preparing" might have been used.

(16) Each "'bus" carries twelve passengers in the *box*, and sixteen on the top.

A very natural mistake, as the inside of an omnibus closely resembles a box; but the box of a coach is the seat on which the driver sits—so called because the space beneath serves as a box.

(17) He doesn't *care* to go to jail, but is not now prepared to do so until he sees that he is leaving many worthy successors to take up the cause.

When the verb to "care" is followed by the infinitive, as in the text, it means to be inclined or disposed to do the

act expressed by the infinitive. But the writer means to use the verb in the sense of to be anxious or concerned about a thing; and this sense requires the construction "does not care *about going* to jail."

(18) Such a conference is hardly the material out of which an Imperial Constitution could eventually be *carried out.*

We might speak of carrying out the *principles* of a constitution, but here the word wanted is "created" or "formed."

(19) They hardly expected that the prejudices of Englishmen themselves would come in the way of a consummation so devoutly *cherished.*

"A consummation devoutly to be wished" is a quotation from Hamlet now often used in ordinary speech. But it does not do to substitute "cherished" for "wished" as in this passage, for as long as prejudices prevent consummation there is nothing to be cherished.

(20) We can only *comment* that the plan was broadly an excellent one.

To "comment" means to make remarks upon, and is not used to introduce a subjunctive clause. "Observe" would do.

(21) How skilfully she *confined* her.

To "confine," in reference (as here) to childbed, is used only in the passive.

(22) We are not sure if it is complimentary or *deprecatory.*

Of course "depreciatory," which is the opposite of complimentary, is meant; not "deprecatory," which is connected with prayer, not with price. The error may be a misprint.

(23) I *discussed* freely that the Sanatana Dharma series are advaitic.

To "discuss" conveys nothing as to the view advocated

and takes as its object only the question or subject considered. Here "argued" would be the proper word.

(24) Voices from the deep seem to bid aspiration to restrain itself and ambition to *dismount*.

This sense of to "dismount," though used by Spenser, is now obsolete. To "descend" would do, or to "sink," or "dwindle."

(25) How to *emphasise* on the minds of Indian women the fact that . . .

"Impress" would be better than "emphasise" here. "Emphasise on the minds" is a very awkward structure, because the emphasis is not on the minds but on the fact that follows.

(26) The insinuation is serious *enough* for the Government to let it stand uncorrected.

"Serious enough" is no doubt a mistake for "too serious," the error arising from the fact that the Indian languages have no precise equivalent for the adverb "too."

(27) Amidst all his trials and troubles the Hindu thinks *ever and anon* of this lofty goal.

There is no grammatical error here, but the writer probably meant rather more than he says. To the native ear the phrase "ever and anon" does not express as great a frequency as the words literally suggest, and as the foreigner naturally supposes them to express. It is a weaker term than "constantly" or "continuously."

(28) After a simple *fare* she showed me my room.

"Fare" means food in the abstract, and does not take the indefinite article. Here we should say "After a simple *meal*."

(29) There seem to be some Christian missionaries who are *fondling themselves* with the hope that etc.

To "fondle oneself" is not, I think, a known English expression. To "fondle" seems to be always used in a concrete sense. "Are fooling themselves" would be allowable.

(30) The sastric and all other arguments were *forwarded* on both sides.

This should be were "advanced," or "put forward." An argument may forward the cause in which it is advanced, but it cannot be said to be itself forwarded—unless, indeed, by amending some deficiency in its substance.

(31) All the *ground* is *run*.

We may say all the race is run or all the ground is covered, but not as above.

(32) They have pondered with pain over some of its social aspects, and *grudged* no sacrifice in removing them.

We do not grudge a hardship or an evil, but an advantage or object of desire. To "grudge" conveys a sense of envy or of dissatisfaction at what another enjoys. "Shrank from no sacrifice" would do.

(33) If inferior men are to be appointed of necessity, they *had rather* be brought out from England than obtained from the local bar.

It would be correct to say "they had better be etc.," or to say "they should rather be etc."; and the only reason why the form above is not allowable would seem to be that it has acquired a special meaning different to what is intended in the text. "They had rather be etc." means they would prefer to be—the preference being in the mind of the subject (the pronoun "they"). "They had better be etc." also implies preference, but the preference may be

in the mind of the speaker, not in that of the subject (the pronoun "they").

(34) He went on long voyages, visited the great cities of upper India, and wound up by a *hermitage* in the Himalayas.

"Hermitage" means a *place* of seclusion not the practice of living in seclusion.

(35) He kept a school until he could not get the permission of the authorities to *hold* it.

To "*hold* school" means the actual conducting of a school at a particular moment, and is not synonymous with "*keep* a school." Again the construction of the sentence is Indian and not English—for "until he could not get etc.," we should say "as long as he could get etc."

(36) The masses were given out as being greatly attached to the district official, who loved them with a passionate love. This *idyll* has been *shattered*.

Even if "idyll" may stand for a fanciful composition in general and unconnected with pastoral poetry, the use of the verb "shatter" here is strange and suggests some association in thought with "idol" or "ideal."

(37) Many *incredulous* stories are told about him.

This use of "incredulous" is now obsolete. The word should be "incredible."

(38) Another *jobbery* is about to be practised by the "patriots."

This should be either "another job," or "another piece of jobbery."

"TO KEEP."

(39) I was about to sit down when he said: "Stand up, you are a prisoner." I *kept standing*.

This is not positively wrong, but any native would say "I remained standing." This use of the verb to "keep" with

a present participle is in vogue rather in connection with rapidly *repeated* than with continuous action. It is natural to say "he kept moving about," "he kept interrupting," "he kept crying out"; but not "he kept sitting," "he kept sleeping." In its transitive senses also this verb is far too commonly used by Indian writers, as in the following examples :—

(40) *Keeping* matted hair.

(41) To a prince of the Travancore royal family, *keeping* a moustache would require moral courage.

Here for "keeping" we should say "wearing."

(42) Do not rich Svadeshi agitators *keep* English furniture in the house.

For "keep" we should say "have."

(43) Mr. Morley is known to have been *keeping* active correspondence with the Viceroy on various subjects of importance.

For "keeping" we should say "carrying on." It would be possible indeed to say "keeping up," but that would rather accentuate the continuation as distinguished from the beginning of the correspondence.

(44) A Burman has cut off his wife's nose, as she had not *kept* his meal ready at the proper time.

It is possible to speak of *keeping* a thing ready after it has been once prepared, but the writer here evidently refers to the preparation and should have said "*got* ready."

(45) The judicial system was as perfect as could be expected. Judicial officers were *kept* in all central places.

Had there been a question of sending the officers to outlying places, it would be correct, in contradistinction, to speak of *keeping* them in the central places. But the writer probably means only that they were *appointed* in central places.

(46) The saheb *kept* his camp at Dadhal.

Here also "kept" would be right if there had been a question of moving the camp, and, in contradistinction to that alternative, it had been determined to *continue* it at Dadhal. But all the writer means is that the saheb encamped at Dadhal.

"LATELY" AND "LATTERLY."

(48) On Pharos a lighthouse was *latterly* erected.

The distinction between "lately" and "latterly" (though they are sometimes interchangeable) should be observed. "Lately" means merely *recently*, without any suggestion as to a previous state of things; "latterly" also means *recently*, but it expresses comparison, and suggests a change in condition. Of a single individual act, therefore, such as the building of a lighthouse, or a birth, a marriage, or a death, we should say that it occurred *lately*, and not "latterly," because no comparison is involved. But it would be appropriate to say "His health has failed him latterly," "He has shown a different demeanour latterly."

(47) We never *knew* that Lord Elgin would be so dead to all logic and humanity.

A native would say "We never *thought* . . ."

(49) The evidence *let in* by the petitioners.

The writer means "adduced" or "put in." Evidence is *let in* only by the judge who admits it.

(50) The hope that India will surely *merge* in Christianity.

There is no grammatical error here, but a thing can only merge in something of the same nature. One race may merge in another, or one religion in another, but we cannot speak of a country merging in a religion. A thing that

merges loses its identity, but a country would not lose its identity by changing its religion.

"To Move."

(51) Do you realise how our God is represented in his very heart? You would then know how to *move* with them (women).

"Move" is probably here a translation of the Indian word *chal* (or its Telugu equivalent) which primarily means to *move*, but means also to *conduct oneself*, to *behave*. But "move" does not bear this sense in English. The sentence should run "know how to behave towards them."

(52) A missionary has more opportunities of *moving* closely with the people.

Here also we should rather say "dealing with" or "coming in close contact with."

(53) There was no official help forthcoming to put down the disturbance in the *niche* of time.

"Niche" should be "nick": the two words have no connection with each other.

(54) It is a nine-penny wonder.

This expression is unknown in English. Perhaps the writer had "nine days wonder" in mind.

(55) If Lord Cromer had been young enough to continue at his post, there is *nothing* to suppose that he would not have endeavoured to satisfy native aspirations.

This should be "*no reason* to suppose." So also in the next two:—

(56) They went off in a panic and do not seem inclined to come back. There is *nothing* now however for them to stay away.

(57) There is *nothing* for despair.

(58) Such is the story told by our friend, and there is *nothing* to disbelieve him.

Instead of "nothing" we should have "no reason" or "no ground"; or the sentence might run "nothing to cause us to disbelieve him."

(59) When the chamber was reached, a snake was found, its head scotched by a *nut-cracker*.

The word "nut-cracker" is here, no doubt, a translation of *sarota*, or some equivalent, which means a betel-nut *cutter*. Now the betel-nut is not known in England and such nuts as we have are *cracked* and not *cut*. Hence this very common mistake. "Voluntarily causing grievous hurt by cutting off his wife's nose with a nut-cracker" is no unfamiliar entry in a magisterial return.

(60) To meet special needs which were difficult to *obtain*.

No one could desire to *obtain* needs, but rather to *mitigate* or *relieve* them.

(61) Mr. Mudholkar *occupied* the chair amid loud cheers and delivered a long speech.

To "occupy" implies retention or continuation in addition to mere taking. In connection with the cheers it can only be meant that he *took* the chair.

(62) Those who manufacture and dispose *off* their products bonâ-fide.

(63) The Liberal party disposes *off* in a liberal spirit only those questions that are . . .

Apparently "off" is here used as an adverb, as in such expressions as to "cut off," to "throw off." But we never say to "dispose off." The preposition "of" is required, as in such expressions as to "treat of," to "hear of."

(64) A critic of our educational system has recently *opined* that the reforms needed in our Universities are three.

To "opine" means to *be* of opinion, not to *express* an opinion.

(65) The dismay and consternation which had *overcrowded* us.

A mistake for "overwhelmed," "overpowered," or "overcome."

(66) The removal of their legitimate grievances will *pacify* the situation.

To "pacify" is used only of personal words, or quasi-personal such as country. With "situation," as used in the text, the usual word is "relieve."

(67) Government have decided to appoint an Oriental scholar on a *pay* of about Rs.800 monthly.

"Salary" would be better than "pay" here. The latter is primarily an abstract noun allied with "peace" and meaning "satisfaction." As such it is used without the indefinite article, and though we may say "the pay" or "his pay" etc., we do not, I think, ever say "*a* pay."

(68) The least causes of dissatisfaction, however frivolous (and these could be easily *picked up*) subject the poor little girl-wife to all sorts of ill-treatment.

A native would not say "pick up a cause." The idiom "pick a quarrel" was perhaps in the writer's mind. "Found" would be the natural word to use.

(69) *Possible* of the highest development.

"Possible" is a mistake for "capable." The first refers rather to the existence or happening of a thing itself, the other to its adaptation or subjection to something else.

(70) It should be the means of *providing* the wants of the needy.

Instead of "providing" we should have either "providing for" or "supplying." The difference in the use of the two verbs "provide" and "supply" should be noted. The latter, because it means to fill up, can have as its object

either the want itself or the thing wanted; but to "provide a want" would mean rather to create a want.

(71) It is quite *raw*.

This is given as the translation of *ekdam kacha hai*, the question being whether a certain apple was ripe enough to be eaten. *Kacha* means either "raw" or "unripe," but these two words have quite distinct meanings in English.

(72) The mother's instinct would never *reconcile* with the thought of her son being the murderer.

To "reconcile" is never used in this intransitive sense in modern English. "Acquiesce in" would do.

(73) When Governments launch criminal proceedings against Indian journalists, they always *remind* the public *whether* the latter have really deserved . . .

A person can be reminded only of something which has previously been in his mind—we cannot say "remind whether . . ." "Put the public in mind of the question whether . . ." would do, or "Raise the question in the mind of the public whether . . ."

(74) A *remove* of the doubt as to the law of inheritance applicable.

This is an old use of the word "remove"—in modern English we should say "removal." "Remove" is now used rather in respect of motion on the part of the subject of the verb than of motion of the object. In other words the noun "remove" is connected rather with the intransitive verb remove, and "removal" with the transitive.

(75) These gentlemen manage to secure an immunity from punishment by *renouncing* and repudiating those whom they have imposed upon

It is not now usual to use the word "renounce" with a

person as the object, though, indeed, "to renounce the devil and all his works" is such an instance. Possibly "denounce" is meant, but that would be perhaps too strong a word for the occasion.

(76) We have *rusticated* too long; we have now to turn our apt hands to new work and bend our muscles to sturdier and honester labour.

"Rusticate" is a curious word to use here, and suggests association with the word "rusty." But "rusticate" means only to live in the country.

"SAY," "SPEAK," "TALK," AND "TELL."

(77) I *speak* with all sincerity that had I been asked . . .

This should be "I say with etc.," or "I tell you with etc."; but to speak is never followed by a clause introduced by the conjunction "that." Nor is "speak" followed by the actual words uttered, as in the following:—

(78) In 1877 Lord Lytton *spoke*: "You, Natives of India, whatever your race and whatever your creed have a recognised claim to share . . ."

When "speak" is used transitively, the object represents rather the *character* than the *substance* of what is spoken; that object is usually reflective or quasi-reflective in its nature. Thus we say "to speak a word," "to speak the truth," to speak English"; but to make "speak" govern an object which stands for the substance of what is said, as in the next example is wrong.

(79) *Whatever* Ajit Singh may have *spoken*.

It is, indeed, no easy matter to distinguish the proper uses of the four verbs to "say," to "speak," to "talk," and to "tell." Each one of the four may be used either transitively or intransitively; but it is well to remember that to

"say" and to "tell" are primarily transitive, and only in particular uses intransitive, while the converse is the case with to "speak" and to "talk." Again, it may be noted that multitudinous as are the uses of these verbs, and frequently as those uses overlap, the primary notion in connection with each is quite different—namely, with

to say—to make a declaration,
to tell—to make a communication,
to speak—to exercise the faculty of speech,
to talk—to carry on a conversation.

It is possible only to indicate differences, and not give finite distinctions. Thus to "tell" is more specific than to "say," and ordinarily takes two objectives—the thing told and the person to whom it is told—while to "say" takes the former only. Again to "tell the truth" is more specific than to "speak the truth." The direction "Speak the truth" means "Whatever you say, let it be true"; but "Tell the truth" means "Say what is true about the particular matter in hand." We may say "Speak French" or "Talk French," but not "Say French," or "Tell French"—"French" being not a true objective, but only qualifying the action of what are primarily intransitive verbs. In the next example "talk" should be "say":—

(80) Now and then the conduct of reactionaries gives the lie to what they *talk*.

So also in the next two. But "Talk *as* we may" would be right.

(81) *Talk* what we may.
(82) Why unnecessarily *talk* unpleasant things?

On the other hand, in the next example, "say" requires such an objective as has been wrongly given to "talk" in the last two preceding ones:—

(83) But when I have *said so far* I have not ended.

"So much" should be substituted for "so far," or else "spoken" for "said."

(84) And lastly he points out, to *say* in plain words, that R. B. Manubhai and Mr. Vinayak were devoid of common-sense.

Here the clause introduced by "that" depends not upon the verb "say" but on the previous verb "points out." The clause in which "say" occurs is parenthetical and grammatically independent—it deals with the manner of speech, not with the substance of what is said, and therefore "speak" is the proper verb to use.

(85) "Tell me what happened after that?" eagerly inquired the Nawab.

This is an instance of the dramatic Indian way of putting the substance of an enquiry into direct, instead of oblique, narration. In English the sentence is grammatically wrong, because "Tell me" is a *command* and not an *enquiry*. For the same reason the note of interrogation is wrong. If "said" were substituted for "enquired," the sentence would be correct. Or if "tell me" were omitted it would be correct, including the note of interrogation.

(86) I found the superintendent on the spot and *told* him "Why are your police treating these men?"

This is an Indian idiom but it is not English. In English if the words spoken are to be given as uttered the previous verb must be "say" and not "tell." To "tell" always introduces the *substance* of the communication—"I *told* him *he* was right," or "I *said* to him 'You are right.'" To "say" however does not necessarily introduce direct

narration—" He said ' I am sure ' " and " He said he was sure " are both correct.

(87) A sensible and *sensate* appeal.

It is difficult to see any force in the unusual word " sensate " here—any appeal that is audible must be sensate.

(88) In all likelihood it was to *serve* this evil that the practice came into existence.

To *serve* an evil would be to aid it. Some such word as " prevent " is wanted. It is correct to speak of serving an end or a purpose.

(89) The *setting down* of the Conference into a definite institution.

A native would rather say the " building up." Possibly the writer had the verb " *settle* down " in mind, but it would not be appropriate.

(90) The *shorter* the *field* for marriage, the greater the difficulty in obtaining brides and bride-grooms.

" Field for marriage " is not a happy phrase, but, passing over that, we should not apply the adjective " short " to the word " field," whether used literally or in the sense of range or scope.

(91) The *shunning* of the Pariah from society.

The Pariah may be said to be shunned *by* society. But if the fact of his being shut out *from* society is intended, some such word as " exclusion " should be substituted.

(92) We in Bengal have practically *solved* the *situation*.

The word " situation " does not suggest anything requiring solution, and this expression would not be used by a native. We speak of solving a problem, or a difficulty.

(93) Nabobs who would not have allowed him to appear at their kachahris without being *slipshod*.

Apparently "slipshod" is here used as meaning without shoes or with the shoes removed. The word however bears no such meaning. Its primary meaning is down at heel, *i.e.*, having shoes of which the back part is trodden down under the heel. Thence it comes to mean untidy, loose, careless, and is often used figuratively. Thus Lord Lytton speaks of his "slipshod Muse" implying that his compositions were careless and desultory rather than strenuous and concentrated.

(94) It is absurd to say that the poverty of India is the *sole* result of the social customs and character of the people

It would indeed be absurd to say this, as there are many other results of the social customs. But what the writer no doubt means is that it is absurd to say that the poverty is the result *only* of the social customs etc.

(95) The walls of those high tariffwalas need to be scaled, and a *solid* breach made in them.

A "solid breach" is a contradiction in terms. There are plenty of possible substitutes—"wide," "clear," "effective," "decided," etc.

(96) Some Hindu and Parsi ladies sang songs of welcome, at the end of which flowers were *sprinkled*.

To "sprinkle" is used only of liquids, or of fine substances such as powder; though indeed Cowper has the line:—

"Spacious meads, with cattle sprinkled o'er."

The proper word in the text would be "scattered" or "strewn."

(97) From the birth of the Indian national congress Mr. Badruddin *started* to take a prominent part in the movement.

This should be "*began* to take." The verb to "start"

fixes attention rather on the act of beginning than on the course of action commenced.

(98) If matters go in this *stride*.

"Way" or "manner" would be the correct word.

(99) Mr. Gopala Chari got his promotion at every step, *topping* over one or two of his seniors.

To "top" is not, I think, ever used intransitively in this sense. "Topping one or two etc." might do, but we should rather say "passing over" or "rising over."

(100) If Ranjitsinghi had not distinguished himself as a cricketer on the English *turf*.

The term "the turf," though of course literally just as applicable to the cricket-field, is as a matter of usage restricted among field sports to the race-course or the practice of horse-racing.

(101) *Turn* a *glance* now in another direction.

We should say "Turn your *eyes*" or "*Cast* a glance."

(102) The poor boy was roughly *unarmed*.

This is not wrong but is contrary to common usage. It is better to say "disarmed." This avoids confusion between the participle "unarmed" and the adjective "unarmed," which are not of the same derivation, the prefix *un* in the one being not the same as the prefix *un* in the other, though of the same form. The adjective "unarmed" means merely *without arms* and says nothing as to arms having been previously possessed or not; the participle "unarmed" means *deprived of arms*.

(103) These things are supposed to be enough to make the Indian Government an ideal Government *under the sun*.

The phrase "under the sun" as used here adds absolutely

nothing to the force or sense of the sentence. The phrase means simply "in the world," and is usually preceded either by a negative or by a superlative as "There is no new thing under the sun" or "It is the best place under the sun." Or it may follow any expression which suggests a survey of the whole world before the predication is made, as in Hood's lines :—

"Alas! for the rarity
Of Christian charity
Under the sun!"

(104) Silent workers who are doing good to the world unostensibly.

This would mean "who are doing good to the world without pretending to do so"; but if they are really doing the good they cannot also be pretending to do it. There is in fact no such word as "unostensibly"—"unostentatiously" is meant.

(105) The land is subdivided into mountains, hills, *villages*, plains, meadows and woods.

"Village" is not the equivalent of the Indian *gam* or *gaon* in their wider sense as including the lands of the village; it is rather equivalent to *gaonthal* or that portion of the lands on which the houses stand.

(106) The new scheme ought to succeed in *vouchsafing* greater security of life and property.

To "vouchsafe," as now used, carries with it a sense of personal bestowal—often indeed of condescension—and in the text "ensuring" or "establishing" would be better.

(107) As at present suggested the memorial will take the form of a statue. *Whatever* that be, the people will . . .

The question is not *what* the memorial will be, but *how* the

matter will be decided. Therefore not the pronoun "whatever" but the adverb "however" should have been used.

(108) The doors are *wide* for all and they may freely enter.

Doors may be wide and yet not be open. "Wide open" is the expression intended.

(109) We *wish* it *will* rival the London *Times*.

(110) We *wish* he *will* be able to be among us.

In these instances we should rather say "hope" than "wish." But if "wish" is used the following verb should be "may" not "will."

(111) Mr. Joshi's suggestion about the employment of paid agency is *worth* being taken up.

This is not wrong, but the usual expression would be "worthy of" instead of "worth." The latter word is usually confined to cases in which the second of the two things weighed is something suggestive of value, or of which the value is capable of estimate, such as "worth a million," "worth a rush," "worth while," "worth the trouble."

(112) He *wrang* his hands.

Though "ring" has "rang" as its preterite, "wring" has "wrung." Formerly however it had "wrang."

SECTION II.—WRONG COMPOUNDS.

Probably many Indians will be surprised to learn how frequently they make wrong compounds in speaking English. No doubt they proceed, consciously or unconsciously, upon the analogy of Sanskrit, but the practice in the two languages is not the same. There is a large class of Sanskrit compounds, namely the tatpurusha compounds of the order in

which the first member is used as if it were in the genitive case governed by the second member, which is not known or is at least comparatively rare in English. For example, *deva-putra* in Sanskrit means "a son of a god"; but the corresponding words combined in English—god-son—do not mean a son of a god, but mean a son whose sonship is of a particular spiritual character determined by the first member of the compound. Upon this analogy we get the very familiar error of "family member" for "member of a family"; "state-secretary" for "secretary of state"; "bride price"—a mere translation of the Indian compound *kanya-sulkam*—for "the price of a bride"; and so on.

It is not however to be inferred that tatpurusha compounds in general are unusual in English. Both the appositional (or, as I think they might be called, the adjectival) and the inflectional (or, as they are sometimes called, the dependent) tatpurushas are extremely common. Of the first kind are such compounds as "bed-rock," "firefly," "bridegroom," "flower-pot," "sky-lark"; and of the latter "inkstand," "candlestick," "post-office," "dust-bin," "picture-frame." And a convenient comparison of the two kinds is furnished by the words "house-boat" and "boat-house." In "house-boat" the first member of the compound is appositional or adjectival, and the compound means a boat having the character of a house. But "boat-house" does not mean a house having the character of a boat, but a house for keeping boats in, the first member being inflectional and governed by the second.

But where the great difference between the Sanskrit and the English tatpurusha compound comes in is as to the inflectional case involved. In English it is rarely the

genitive case; in Sanskrit it is usually the genitive. Certainly "harpstring" means nothing but the string of a harp, and "bedpost" the post of a bed; but such examples are few. Far more commonly is the dative the case involved. A candlestick is not a stick of candle, but a stick *for* a candle; a hat-stand is not a stand of hats but a stand *for* hats; and a coffee-cup is not a cup of coffee (though I have heard the compound so used in India) but a cup *for* holding coffee.

Compounds in English, if usage has made them practically single words, are so written, as brickbat, bridegroom; but until the two members have become so unified they are joined by a hyphen, as brick-kiln, bride-cake. But in this stage also they are accented as single words and must be distinguished from mere associations of two words each retaining its own accent. Thus "glass house" means a house made of glass, and each word bears its own accent; but there is a compound "glass-house," which means a house for making glass in, and it is accented on the first syllable only.

Some actual instances of wrong compounds follow:—

(1) It demanded facilities for civil claims of the *State subjects* against the darbar.

Here "State subjects" is used for "subjects of the State"; but the compound would rather mean subjects bearing some character expressed by the term "State," just as a "State railway" is a railway administered by the State.

(2) The replies given by the *Government members* were on the whole satisfactory.

The term "Government member" might be applied to a member nominated by Government to serve on some commission or corporation; because "Government" would

describe his status. But the writer of the text means a member of the Government.

(3) A small pit is dug, which is covered with *sandalwood pieces.*

" Sandalwood pieces " does not express pieces of sandalwood, any more than " chimneypieces " would mean pieces of a chimney. It might be urged that a " gold piece " means a piece of gold; but that is not so—" piece " in the latter expression means a portion, a fragment; in the former it means a separate article, a coin. So again " head-piece " obviously does not mean a piece of the head. " Chimney-piece " and " head-piece " are compounds, but in " sandalwood piece " and " gold piece " the words " sandalwood " and " gold " are separate adjectives.

(4) This medicine cured my *family members.*

(5) The young daughter-in-law produced the article and to the astonished *family-members* described her experiences.

" Family members " does not express members of the family. It might, in a suitable connection, mean members having families, as distinguished from bachelor members.

(6) We are daily getting worse in the matters of *bride-price* and *bridegroom-price.*

These are tatpurusha compounds involving the genitive case, but they are not allowable in English.

(7) It is only to the *English-educated* men one has to look.

(8) *Europe-returned* men.

These are tatpurushas involving other oblique cases, but we require to say " educated in English " and " men who have returned from Europe.'

(9) May I ask the Svami whether there are any mathadhipathis who have done as he does regarding the *foreign-travelled?*

This is a tatpurusha of the appositional class, but it is not a recognised compound in English.

(10) Perhaps you will sell pice *tea cups*.

Here "tea cups" is used for "cups of tea."

SECTION III.—NEW WORDS.

A few examples follow of new forms of words for which there is no authority.

(1) Pass on, it is *alright*.

There is no such word as "alright." The two words "all" and "right" should be written separately.

(2) Mr. Gokhale is an *anti-druggist* and cannot bear the idea of people drugging themselves with either liquor or opium.

There is no such word as "anti-drug"; and therefore "anti-druggist" would not mean one opposed to drugs but one opposed to druggists.

(3) His *audace* is untempered with that element which is seldom absent from *audace* even in its extremist expression.

There is a French word "audace," but the only English form is "audacity."

(4) Cattle-*shade*.

This is a common mistake for cattle-shed. The occasion of the mistake is no doubt climatic, protection from the sun being the most important kind of shelter for cattle in India.

(5) Indian students in Japan openly and freely *interdine*.

(6) One caste is not allowed to intermarry with the same caste of a neighbouring city, although both may *interdine*.

"Interdine" is not English, nor could such a word be formed on the analogy of intermarry, interview, interblend, intercalate, etc. We could not speak of a dinner *between* two castes.

(7) He took a census of the cats, and he gives the exact number of the tom-cats and the *tit-cats* resident in the village.

"Tit-cat" is a plausible formation, but I can find no authority for it.

(8) India is not good at accounts nor *picy* in her dealings.

Picy is neat and expressive and deserves to become current.

SECTION IV.—SLANG AND COLLOQUIALISMS.

"TO AGGRAVATE."

(1) The occasional cases of friction were not sufficiently *aggravating* to set up one whole community against another.

To "aggravate" is sometimes used colloquially in the sense of to irritate or provoke, but its only true meaning is to add weight to or intensify. Thus we speak of an illness being aggravated by some additional symptom, or an offence being aggravated by some additional circumstance. But we should not, in serious writing, use the word absolutely and without reference to any intensifying factor.

"TO CATCH ON."

(2) The extent to which the Indian mind has *caught on* with the modern scientific spirit is quite remarkable.

To "catch on" is a colloquial phrase meaning to come into vogue or favour. Thus one might say: "Cricket was introduced into India and it soon caught on." In the text both the adverb "on" and the preposition "with" should be omitted.

(3) This example ought to *catch on*.

"Catch on" is here used in its proper sense; but it does not go well with the word "example." Only something of a continuing nature, like fashion, habit, practice, can be said to catch on.

"THE FAIR SEX."

The expression the "fair sex" is far too frequently used by Indian writers. While on the one hand we cannot say that it is slang, yet on the other it certainly should not be used as a serious equivalent for "women." It is no doubt much used colloquially, but there is a slight savour, if not of humour, yet of lightness or compliment about it which unfits it for employment in serious writing, as in the instances which follow:—

(4) Their fair sex stands in greater dread of moral perversion.

(5) In the interest of the fair sex, we are bound to put down the new and growing evil in the form of the pernicious practice of extorting varadakshina.

(6) If the object of education is to develop the mental faculties, it is not less important to the fair sex.

"GO IN FOR."

(7) He wanted Indians to *go in for* science.

"Go in for" is a merely colloquial expression.

"GO ONE BETTER."

(8) The reviewer strives to go better than even the talented author himself.

It is perhaps permissible to speak of a reviewer going better than the author, though the expression sounds strange in this connection—it is common enough to speak of one horse going better than another. But the reader of the passage above cannot but feel that the writer had in his mind the colloquial expression to "go one better," which is derived from the practice of gaming, and in which "go" is a transitive verb meaning to offer or bid, and "one better" is its object, meaning one unit more, or one degree more. To "go one better" is thence used in the sense of to overbid, to surpass.

"LEVEL BEST."

(9) They have all the same done their *level best* to influence them towards moderation.

(10) It is our duty to do our *level best* to utilise our raw products.

(11) One of the Bengali members appears to have gone over to the Government side; while the other has no doubt done his *level best* to finger the plague spot.

"Level best" is pure slang. [To "finger" is not used in the sense of to point out; to "put one's finger on" may be so used.]

"DO THE NEEDFUL."

(12) He suggested that *the needful* would be done if one third of the population lived on industry.

(13) Do *the needful* for the real advancement of the country.

(14) The local Government does not wish to make the agriculturists wait until imperial legislators find time to do *the needful.*

(15) Mr. Baker expressed his readiness to do *the needful* in the matter.

(16) Representatives to consult the leading men and do *the needful.*

To "do the needful" is a slang expression.

"NO GO."

(17) India *has no go* but to adjust herself to the needs of the times.

(18) Face them you must; *there is no go,* if you don't face them, they face you nevertheless.

"No go" is slang and should not be used in serious composition. Moreover the idiom is "it's no go," not "*has* no go," or "*there's* no go."

"PRECIOUS."

(19) Being kept entirely aloof from the affairs of the State, he could effect *precious* little during the life-time of his father.

To use "precious" as an adverb for "very" or "extremely" is a mere colloquialism.

"TO MAKE ONE'S SELF SCARCE."

(20) The persons against whom warrants are likely to be issued may *make themselves scarce.*

This expression is a mere colloquialism.

"TO SIT TIGHT."

(21) We seem to think that somebody will push us from behind into the path of progress, and all that we need do, is to *sit tight* and even refuse to move.

To "sit tight" is pure slang and differs in meaning from to "sit still" (which seems to be intended here). To "sit tight" expresses all that is meant by the phrase which follows it, to "refuse to move."

"TO SIT UPON."

(22) Unless the lucky four (cadets) are, when in the army, thoroughly hard worked and *sat upon* and made to do even more work than the ordinary subaltern, they will probably degenerate.

To "sit upon" is a slang form for to repress.

"TO THANK."

(23) Private occupants of houses might *thank* a public body like the Trust to show how the device is to be carried out.

(24) I shall *thank* you if you will allow me to . . .

This use of the verb "to thank" is somewhat offensive. It assumes complaisance with what is asked, and has the effect therefore of changing into a demand what is in form a request. Certainly the offence is much mitigated if, as in the second example, the word is followed by "if" instead of the usual infinitive, as "I'll thank you to be quiet."

FINIS.

INDEX.

About, 63
Absolutely, 51
Absorb, 188
Accompany, 118
Adapt, 120
Address, 120
ADJECTIVES, 98
Administer, 220
ADVERBS, 40
Advice and *Advices*, 86
Advise, 220
Against, 63
Ago, 185
Aggravate, 245
Aim, 220
Akin, 98
All Over, 48, 164
Almost, 48, 49
Alphabet, 220
"*Alright*," 244
Amaze, 123
Among, 63
And, 80, 200
"*Anti-druggist*," 244
Any and *Some*, 98
Anyhow and *Somehow*, 49
Applauses, 86
Appreciably, 221
Approximate, 221
ARTICLES, 11
As, 165, 207
As for *Than*, 79
As much . . . as, 189
Aspire, 60
Assemble, 221
As Well As, 208
At, 63
At least, 157, 158
Attainment, 221
"*Audace*," 244
Auxiliary Verbs, 104
Avow, 120
Away, 40
Backwards, 49
Balance of Sentence, 153
"*Banters*," 86
Bear, 221
Bear Witness, 222
Become, 222
Befit, 222
Before for *Ago*, 50
Before for *Until*, 79
Beneath, 64
Betake, 121
Better, 50, 52
Between, 64
Boil down, 210
"*Bombasts*," 88
Both, 98, 208
Bow down, 41
Box, 222
Break, 42
"*Bride-price*," 243
Broach, 120
Bring down, 42
Brush up, 210
But (adverb), 50
But (conjunction), 80
By, 41, 64

Can, 110
Care, 222
Carry out, 223
Catch on, 125, 245
"*Cattle-shade*," 244
Cherish, 223
Clip wings, 211
Colloquialisms, 245
Collect, 46
Combat, 61
Come upon, 77
Comment, 223
Comparatives, 171
Comparative Sentences, 190, 191, 192
Complain, 60, 124, 125

INDEX—*continued.*

Compounds, 240
Comprise, 118
Concede, 204
Conditional Sentences, 152
Confide, 61
Confine, 223
Congress, 202
CONJUNCTIONS, 79
Consent, 62
Consequence, 85
Constructional Errors (general), 187
Contemporary, 172
Contest, 120
Contrast, 62
Could, 110
Counsels, 89
"*Courage of Conviction*," 173
Court, The, 172
Cut and dried, 211
Cut off, 44

Dare say, 173
Defect, 188
Defraud, 119
Degenerate, 125
Demonstrative Pronouns, 94
Deny, 166, 202
Deplore, 119
Deprecatory, 223
Desire, 121, 197, 208
Deter, 61
Develop, 125
Devote, 59
Direct Narration, 149, 235
Disabuse, 197
Discuss, 117, 223
Dismount, 224
Dissociate, 121
Divert, 118
Do, 174
Do so, 174
Double Negative, 202
Down, 41, 42
Draw (boots), 43
Drift, 125
Drudge, 125

Earthly, 176
Emanate, 125
Emphasis, 153,
Emphasise, 122, 224
Encounter, 122
"*English-educated*," 243
Enough, 176, 224
Estrange, 120
"*Europe-returned*," 243
Even, Position of, 159
Ever and Anon, 224
Evidently, Position of, 160
Exert, 124
Extravagances, 86
Eye to Eye, 212

Fair Sex, 246
Fall, 168
"*Family member*," 243
Fare, 224
Faults, 88
Few and *A few*, 33
Finance and *Finances*, 85
Find and *Find out*, 45
Focus, 116
Follow up, 47
Fondle, 225
Foot prints, 212
For, 59, 60, 64
"*Foreign-travelled*," 243
Forward, 225
From, 61, 65
Fruits, 86, 89
Fuels, 87
Future for Past Tense, 139

Garbs, 87
Gather, 43, 46, 163
Gauntlet, 213
Gentleman, 187
Gerund and Infinitive, 140
Give oneself away, 40
Glad, 100
Go by, 41
Go in for, 246
Go one better, 246
Got to, 176
"*Government member*," 242
Grain, Against the, 213
Grains, 89
Grudge, 225
Guess, 63

Had, 126
Had Rather, 225

Hand in Hand, 214
Hardly, 51
Heed, 117
Helping Hand, 36
Hence, 51
Hermitage, 226
Hint, 201
His, 91, 93
His self, 95
Hitherto, 194
Hold and *Hold up*, 48
Hold Water, 177
Honourable, 186

Idioms, 171
Idyll, 226
If, 80
If only, 167
Impress, 194
In and *Into*, 66
Incarnate, 120
Incredulous, 226
Infinitive and Gerund, 140
Initiate, 123
In Statu Quo, 196
Instructions, 86
Intensely, 52
"*Interdine*," 244
Interest and *Interests*, 87
Interrogative Sentences, 148
In the Least, 181
Into, 66
Intransitive Verbs, 116
Inversion of subject and predicate, 148
Invite, 60
Issue and *Issues*, 85
Is to, 113
It, 177
Its, 91, 92
Itself, 95

Jobbery, 226
Judge, 60

Keep, 226
"*Kill out*," 44
Knock bottom out, 214
Know and *Know of*, 180
Know better and *Know more*, 52

Labour, 60
Lately and *Latterly*, 228
Launch, 122
Leave in the lurch, 215
Leave severely alone, 169
Legion, 30
Lest, 82, 170
Let in (evidence), 228
Let well alone, 181
Level best, 247
Leverage, 214
Lick into shape, 214
Life-long, 100
Light and *Light up*, 47
Like, 81
Likely, 166
Lord, 186
Lurch, Leave in the, 215

Make and *Make up*, 47
Make One's self Scarce, 248
Manifest, 117
Many, 89
Meaning not conveyed, 163
Menace, 203
Merge, 62, 228
METAPHORS, 210
Might, 113
Mince Matters, 181
Miss, 118
More (adjective), 52, 101
More and *Better*, 52
Most, 52
Move, 229
Much, 52, 53
Must, 115
Myself, 96

Nearly, 53
Need, 89, 182
Needful, Do the, 247
Negative Sentences, 150, 182
Negative, Double, 202
New Wine in Old Bottles, 215
New Words, 244
Neither . . . nor, 81, 150
Next, 101
Niche, 216, 229
No Go, 247
No sooner, 82
Nothing, 229

INDEX—*continued.*

NOUNS, 85
Nut-cracker, 230

Oblain, 230
Occupy, 230
Of, 69, 230
Off, 53, 230
Offsprings, 88
Often, 101
On, 72
One, 101
Only, 54
Only if, 167
Only, Position of, 162, 167
On the Contrary, 54
On the other Hand, 54
Opine, 230
Opinion, 203
Order, 123
Order of Words, 155
Over, 73

Pacify, 231
Part and Parcel, 30, 87
Participle in "-ing," 133
Pass and *Pass by*, 41
Pass in Review, 183
Passive Voice, 204
Pay, 231
Pence and *Pennies*, 90
People, 119
Permeate, 118, 121
Pervade, 118, 122
Petition, 121
Pick up, 41, 231
"*Picy*," 245
Pluperfect Tense, 126
Point and *Point out*, 44
Possessive Pronouns, 91
Possible, 231
Precious, 247
PREPOSITIONS, 59
Present, 61
Printer's Devil, 216
Provide, 62, 231
PRONOUNS, 91
Puff up, 123
Pull through, 124
Pull up, 46, 47
Put down, 42
Put in Appearance, 182

Rather, 225
Raw, 232
Reach, 121, 122
Recommend, 118
Reconcile, 232
Regret, 120
Reins, 219
Relative Clauses, 191, 192, 198, 206
Remind, 232
Remove, 232
Renounce, 232
Resolve, 44
Resource and *Resources*, 88
Reverend, 186
Revert, 126
Ring the Bells, 216
Rise to the Occasion, 183
Rod, 217
Round, 73
Run the Gauntlet, 213
Rusticate, 233

"*Sandalwood Pieces*," 243
Say, 233
Scarce, Make One's self, 248
Search, 169
Sensate, 236
Serve, 236
Set down, 236
Severely Alone, 169
Shake in One's Shoes, 217
Shall and *Will*, 104
Shame, 184
Shoes, Shake in One's, 217
Short, 236
Should, 109
Shoulder to the Wheel, 217
Show and *Show off*, 44
Shun, 236
Sift, 196, 218
Since, 74
Single, 101
Sir, 186
Sit Tight, 248
Situation, 236
Sit upon, 248
Slang, 245
Slipshod, 237
So, 54, 55
Sole, 237

Solid, 237
Some and *Any*, 98
Somehow and *Anyhow*, 49
Source, 218
Speak, 233
"*Spot out*," 43
Sprinkle, 237
Standard, 202
Stand up to, 62
Start, 237
"*State Secretary*," 241
"*State Subject*," 242
Status quo, 196
Stick up to, 43
Still and *Yet*, 55
Still-born, 102
Substitute, 208
Such, 97, 102
Suffer, 121
Suggest, 118
Supervene, 122
Swear and *Swear in*, 43
Swell, 123
SYNTAX, 148

Take and *Take up*, 48
Take off, 184
Take one's life, 184
Talk, 233
"*Tea-cups*," 244
Tell, 233
Tenses, 126
Thames on Fire, 218
Than, 82
Thank, 123, 248
That (conjunction), 80, 81, 82, 170
That (pronoun), 94, 97
There, 177
Thread, 219
Time, Periods of, 184
"*Tit-cat*," 245
Titles, 186
To, 75
To a degree, 194
Top, 238
Transitive Verbs, 116
Travel and *Travels*, 89
Treat, 61
Turf, The, 238
Turn, 238

Unarmed, 238
Under the Sun, 238
Undo, 119
Unlike, 185
"*Unostensibly*," 239
Unversed, 102
Up, 46, 47, 48, 77
Upon, 77
Up to, 75

VERBS, 104
Very (adverb), 19
Very (adjective), 102, 103
Vest, 62
Village, 239
Vision and *Visions*, 86
Visit, 123
VOCABULARY, 220
Vouchsafe, 239

Wait on, 59
Want, 119, 209,
Waver, 61
Wear out, 42
Wedge, Thin End of, 218
Well, 58
What, 96
Whatever, 239
When, 83, 209
Where, 83
Whether, 83
Which, 96, 97
Whole, 103
Whose, 94
Wide, 240
Wish, 199, 240
Will and *Shall*, 104
With, 78
Within, 78
Worth and *Worthy*, 198, 240
Would, 109

Yet and *Still*, 55